
LIBERAL

HANDBOOK

1914



Platform of Manitoba Liberals

1914

Based on Resolutions adopted by the Provincial Liberal Convention held in Winnipeg, March 26 and 27, 1914

1. Compulsory Education; Obligatory Teaching of English; Larger Grants for Schools; Educational Facilities for Every Child; Repeal of Coldwell Amendments.
2. Referendum on "Banish the Bar"; Reduction of Licenses; Abolition of Proprietary Clubs; Resident Municipal Electors to Control Number and Class of Licenses.
3. Woman Suffrage.
4. Direct Legislation.
5. Strict Laws Against Electoral Corruption; Impartial Administration of Justice.
6. Protection of Industrial Wage Earners.
7. Encouragement of Agriculture; Extension of Practical Education; Development of Co-operative Methods, including Cheaper Money; A Public Abattoir.
8. Good Roads Through Co-operation with Municipalities.
9. Encouragement of Hydro-Electric Development.
10. Natural Resources for the Province.
11. Municipal Autonomy in Local Taxation..

Resolutions

Adopted at Liberal Convention held in Winnipeg, March 26 and 27, 1914

EDUCATION

This Convention deplores the educational conditions existing in this Province and condemns the fact that through the laxity of our laws and their enforcement:

- (a) An alarmingly large number of children of school age are not being educated;
- (b) In many of our schools the children are not being taught to speak the English language.

THEREFORE, the Liberal Party, if returned to power, stands pledged:

To maintain unimpaired the integrity of the national school system of this Province (Act of 1897).

To make it the first duty of the Government to bring suitable educational facilities within reach of all the children of the Province.

To make the adequate teaching of English obligatory in all public schools.

To enact amendments to the present school law to provide a measure of compulsory education, which, while respecting the personal rights and religious convictions of the individual, shall make it obligatory on parents and guardians of all children that such children shall receive a proper elementary education, either by attendance at the public schools or by such substitute within the choice of the parents as shall attain this end.

To increase the efficiency of rural schools by much more liberal grants from the Legislature (not less than \$200 per teacher per annum in rural schools), and more careful supervision.

To repeal the Coldwell amendments.

TEMPERANCE

That this Convention condemns the administration of the liquor license laws as grossly inefficient, corrupt and partisan, and declares that the Roblin Government is responsible therefor and should on this account, and on account of its opposition to all proposals of reform, be condemned by all citizens who believe in moral progress and honest enforcement of the law.

That the Liberal Party, recognizing the grave evils, disorders and corrupting influences associated with the liquor traffic, especially the bar sale of liquor and the treating custom, re-affirms its declarations of unqualified sympathy with the temperance cause, and pledges itself:

1. To pass an Act for the abolition of the bar, to be prepared by the recognized temperance forces, and to submit such Act to a referendum, which Act, if endorsed by the electors, shall be put into operation, and shall have the hearty support of the Liberal Party in its thorough enforcement.
2. To amend the Liquor License Act so as to ensure a large reduction in the number of liquor licenses, the abolition of proprietary club licenses and the prohibition of the sale of liquor on Christmas Day, Good Friday and Thanksgiving Day.
3. To amend the Local Option Law by providing: (a) That any municipality shall have the power to limit, reduce or abolish any class of liquor licenses, as well as to shorten the hours of sale; (b) that resident voters only shall have

the right to vote; (c) that no liquor license shall be issued where a local option by-law has been carried and subsequently quashed on technical grounds.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The Liberal Party, believing that there are no just grounds for debarring women from the right to vote, will enact a measure providing for equal suffrage, upon it being established by petition that this is desired by adult women to a number equivalent to fifteen per cent of the vote cast at the preceding general election in this Province.

DIRECT LEGISLATION

That this Convention endorses the principle of direct legislation by means of the initiative and referendum, and maintains that the adoption of this reform as a part of our system of government would give effect to the will of the people, and would therefore be entirely in harmony with true democracy and British constitutional government.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

This Convention deplores the systematic prostitution of justice for party ends by the Roblin Government, its persistent refusal to amend the numerous glaring defects in election laws and to prosecute persons guilty of election crimes.

And pledges itself:

1. To the faithful and impartial administration of justice in the Province.
2. To so amend the Election Act as to provide adequate punishment for election offences and to enforce the same.
3. To so amend the Controverted Elections Act as to provide for a more simple procedure and a speedy trial of election petitions.

PROTECTION OF WAGE EARNERS

This Convention records itself in favor of progressive legislation for the assistance and protection of wage earners and the improvement of conditions of living; the effective application of fair wage clauses to provincial government contracts; the enforcement by imposition of adequate penalties and otherwise of prompt payment of wages by government contractors.

An 8-hour day on all government contracts.

In favor of so amending the Workmen's Compensation Act as to give more adequate compensation and more expeditious settlement of all claims.

AGRICULTURAL AID

Recognizing the intimate relation that exists between the prosperity of the farming community and the well being of the whole community, and deplored the failure of the government to deal adequately with the economic necessities of the Province, the Liberal Party pledges itself, if returned to power:

To develop and give effect to a progressive agricultural policy, embodying among others, these features:

The extension of agricultural education by more practical demonstration farms and by direct instruction, thus taking the agricultural college to the farmer.

The encouragement by advice, support and necessary financial assistance of co-operative movements among farmers for the buying of supplies, the marketing of products and the

securing of necessary funds for farming purposes upon more advantageous terms.

To establish at once a public abattoir.

GOOD ROADS

That inasmuch as the prosperity of the Province depends in a great measure upon the existence of good roads, the Liberal Party re-affirms its policy of co-operating with the municipalities in the matter of road building, and declares that all provincial aid given should be spent through the municipal councils.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT

That the Liberal Party favors the extension of hydro-electric power throughout the Province so as to enable the benefits of light and power at reasonable rates to be enjoyed by as large a portion of the Province as is economically feasible.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The Liberal Party in convention assembled, pledges itself to take all possible steps to secure the immediate transfer of Manitoba's lands and natural resources from the Dominion of Canada to this Province.

MUNICIPAL TAXATION

Resolved, that this Convention go on record as favoring legislation which will give municipalities local option as to classification of properties for taxation.

CONFIDENCE IN LIBERAL LEADER

That this Convention expresses its complete confidence in T. C. Norris as leader of the Liberal Party, and desires to put on record its appreciation of the services rendered by him and the Liberal members of the Legislature in the cause of progressive government during the past four years.

CONDEMNATION OF ROBLIN GOVERNMENT

The present government of Manitoba merits the condemnation of the people of this province:

BECAUSE it has been inefficient, extravagant, and partisan in its administration; it has squandered the natural resources of the Province for the benefit of individuals; it has diverted to party uses a large and growing proportion of grants for public purposes.

BECAUSE it has manipulated for partisan purposes the constituencies of the Province so as to deprive many of them of the basis of approximately equitable representation in the Legislature.

BECAUSE in the fact of positive and definite charges made by members of the Legislature on the floor of the House, it has refused to grant any inquiry into such charges.

BECAUSE it has persistently violated the British traditions of justice, having by a subservient magistracy and provincial police utilized the processes of law for partisan purposes; has instigated and encouraged electoral corruption and used the civil service for that end; has condoned political crimes; has fostered and protected drinking dives and gambling resorts under the guise of hotels and proprietary clubs.

BECAUSE it has neglected and refused to ensure to all the children of the Province an education fitting them for the duties of life and the responsibilities of citizenship.

Education

THE LIBERAL POLICY

Resolution adopted at Liberal Convention, March, 1914:

This convention deplores the educational conditions existing in this province and condemns the fact that through the laxity of our laws and their enforcement:

(a) An alarmingly large number of children of school age are not being educated.

(b) In many of our schools the children are not being taught to speak the English language.

Therefore the Liberal Party if returned to power stands pledged:

To maintain unimpaired the integrity of the national school system of the province (Act of 1897).

To make it the first duty of the government to bring suitable educational facilities within reach of all the children of the province.

To make the adequate teaching of English obligatory in all public schools.

To enact amendments to the present school law to provide for a measure of compulsory education, which, while respecting the personal rights and religious convictions of the individual, shall make it obligatory on parents and guardians of all children that such children shall receive a proper elementary education, either by attendance at the public schools or by such substitute within the choice of the parents as shall attain this end.

To increase the efficiency of rural schools by much more liberal grants from the legislature (not less than \$200 per teacher per annum in rural schools), and by more careful supervision.

To repeal the Coldwell amendments.

THE GOVERNMENT'S RESISTANCE TO COMPULSORY EDUCATION

Since 1906, when the Winnipeg School Board prepared and asked the government to pass a bill providing for compulsory education in cities and towns only, the Roblin government has steadily opposed a compulsory measure and the resolutions offered from year to year by the Liberal opposition have been voted down on straight party divisions at the express orders of the Premier or the Minister of Education. In 1914, forced by steadily growing public opinion, amendments were made to the Children's Act which are declared by the Minister of Education to amount to compulsion, but these are clearly a subterfuge and in no way take the place of compulsory education.

In 1906 the Winnipeg School Board, alarmed at the conditions developing in the city, prepared its bill, but found itself unable to get any member of the government to introduce the measure in the house. It was met with direct refusals from the members for both South Winnipeg and North Winnipeg, and in both cases it was known that the refusal was made under instructions from the Roblin government.

In 1907 the Attorney-General was asked if it was the intention of the government to bring in a compulsory education bill. He replied that the government had doubts as to the constitutional powers of the province and had submitted a series of questions to an eminent constitutional lawyer with a view to obtaining his advice. In the provincial elections of 1907 the matter was discussed to some extent and Premier Roblin advanced the argument that the province lacked the constitutional power to enact this legislation. This was dispelled the following year when an opinion was obtained from Donald McMaster, K.C., affirming the rights of the province to enact such legislation.

In 1908, the first session of that legislature, D. A. Ross, M.P.P., moved a resolution endorsing the principle of compulsory education and calling on the government to introduce such a measure. This was voted down, 17 to 11, several government members being absent. It was on this occasion that Hon. Jos. Bernier made his notable declaration: "I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF COMPULSORY EDUCATION. I DO NOT BELIEVE IN ITS PRINCIPLE, NEITHER IN ITS PRACTICABILITY. TO MY MIND THE STATE HAS NO RIGHT TO ESTABLISH IT, AND PARTICULARLY IN THIS PROVINCE. I am satisfied that I have proved that such a measure would be unconstitutional and ultra vires." Premier Roblin, declaring that such legislation would re-open the school question, said: "Having gone through one of these contentious contests, I cannot afford to again open that question." (Winnipeg Telegram, January 16, 1908.) Premier Roblin then asked the house to vote down the resolution.

In 1909, D. A. Ross, M.P.P., introduced a bill providing for compulsory education, which was again rejected by a vote of 26 to 12, Hon. G. R. Coldwell moving the six-months' hoist after a long speech in which he attempted to show that compulsory laws in other provinces were not effective and were not being enforced. "It does not appear to the government," said Mr. Coldwell, "that the thing is advisable, and for that reason the government would be afraid to enact the mildest measure." (Winnipeg Telegram, March 2, 1909.)

In 1910 the Liberal opposition again brought the matter before the government in a resolution which, after setting forth the fact that the pretended constitutional difficulties had been removed by the opinion of Donald McMaster, K.C., the authority to whom it had been referred, called for a measure of compulsory tuition, either public or private, for all children between the ages of 8 and 14 years. On this occasion Hon. G. R. Coldwell in effect repeated his speech of the year before and the resolution was rejected by a vote of 24 to 13.

At the Provincial Liberal Convention, April 6, 1910, the party declared itself in favor of enacting a compulsory education law.

In 1912 the famous Coldwell amendments were passed. On April 4, on the third reading of the bill, Mr. Norris, the Liberal leader, moved an amendment to refer the bill back to committee for the incorporation of amendments to provide an adequate and equitable

measure of compulsory attendance at some efficient school. Premier Roblin himself asked that the amendment be voted down, declaring that "the compulsory education law offered by Mr. Norris would be inoperative, abortive and useless". It was on this occasion that Hon. G. R. Coldwell, referring to the Children's Act, declared: "We have something more effective than compulsory education. We are not wasting time on a myth." Mr. Norris' amendment was rejected on a straight party vote.

In 1913 a bill similar to that of 1909 was introduced again by D. A. Ross, M.P.P., and was again given a six months' hoist on the orders and motion of Premier Roblin, Hon. G. R. Coldwell again opposing the bill on the ground that it would be useless and that all the objects looked for were embodied in the Children's Act. There was again a straight party division.

In 1914 (January) when the government amendments to the Children's Act were before the Law Amendments Committee, T. H. Johnson, M.P.P., offered an amendment providing for compulsory attendance on the responsibility of the parents, except in certain stated cases. This was rejected by the government majority in committee on the orders of Hon. G. R. Coldwell. On the third reading of the bill amending the Children's Act (February 9) Mr. Norris again brought up the subject of compulsory education and S. Hart Green, North Winnipeg, moved an amendment similar to that offered by Mr. Johnson in committee. This was rejected on a straight party vote, 24 to 11. On this occasion again Mr. Coldwell declared that the amendments to the Children's Act, now known as the Truancy Act, were designed to have the same effect, but that in order to avoid complications as to the constitutional rights of the province, they could not be known as a Compulsory Education Act.

ONTARIO COMPULSORY PROVISIONS

When the amendments to the Children's Act, now generally known as the Truancy Act, were before the legislature at the session of 1913-14, amendments were offered by the Liberal opposition, both when the bill was before the Law Amendments Committee and when it came up for its third reading in the house. S. Hart Green, North Winnipeg, offered an amendment to incorporate the clauses in the Ontario School Act which provide for compulsory attendance and argued on each occasion that if the Minister of Education and the members of the Roblin government were in earnest, as they declared themselves, in making the Act a measure assuring compulsory attendance, they should adopt and enforce the principle as laid down in the Ontario Act, which was cited merely as one which has proved reasonable and effective. On both occasions the amendment was voted out by the straight government majority. On the third reading of the bill in the legislature, the amendment offered by Mr. Green was voted down at the behest of Hon. Mr. Coldwell by a straight vote of 24 to 11.

The compulsory clauses of the Ontario School Act, offered by Mr. Green, were as follows:

- "3A. All children between 7 and 14 years of age shall attend school for the full term during which the school of the section or municipality in which they reside is open each year, unless excused for the reasons hereinafter mentioned, and if the parents or guardians having legal charge of such children fail to send them to school regularly for said term or if such children absent themselves from school without satisfactory excuse, such parents, guardians and children shall be subjected to the provisions and penalties of this Act.
- "3B. No parent, guardian or other person shall be liable to any of the penalties of this act in respect of any child.
(1) If the child is under efficient instruction at home or elsewhere. (2) If the child is unable to attend school by reason of sickness or other unavoidable cause. (3) If there is no school within two miles, measured by the nearest road from such child's residence, if such child is under ten years of age, or within three miles if over that age. (4) If there is no accommodation in the school which the child has the right to attend. (5) If the child has been excused as hereinafter provided from attending school by a justice of the peace, or by the principal of the school which such child is entitled to attend. (6) If the child has passed the entrance examination for high schools, as prescribed by the Education Department."

The amendment was lost by 11 votes to 24, the division again being a straight party one.

DECLARATIONS IN FAVOR OF COMPULSORY EDUCATION

The Christian Endeavor Convention at Portage la Prairie, March 8th, 1909, unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that a compulsory education law was essential and praying that such should be immediately placed on the statute books.

The Free Kindergarten Association of Winnipeg, at its annual meeting held January 24, 1909, listened to strong addresses on the absolute necessity of a compulsory education law by Mrs. Atkinson, First Vice-president, Mrs. Margaret Scott and J. H. T. Falk, Secretary of the Associated Charities, based on their own observations and reports from visiting nurses and charity workers, that too many children who should be at school were remaining at home, with unfortunate results to themselves and the community.

The Manitoba Educational Association, at its meeting held in Winnipeg, April 16, 1909, adopted a resolution that "The chief duty of the state is education, and this association recommends that the compulsory law be placed on the statute books". A year later the same association, meeting at Brandon, March 31, 1910, reaffirmed their stand and regretted the "failure of the government to take any action in that direction".

The School Trustees Section of the Manitoba Educational Association, meeting in Winnipeg, March 2, 1910, resolved: "That this convention believes it necessary that school legislation be amended at once to exact regular attendance from all pupils."

The Orange Grand Lodge of Manitoba, in session in Winnipeg, March 3, 1910, after a vigorous discussion carried by unanimous standing vote a resolution in favor of a compulsory education law and every

man voting for it pledged himself individually to do everything in his power to obtain the passing and enforcing of such an Act.

The Trades and Labor Council, representing organized labor in Winnipeg, on the same day, March 3, 1910, adopted unanimously a report which endorsed the resolutions and actions of the Educational Association and ordered that the Minister of Education be so advised.

At the thirteenth annual session of the Grand Chapter of the Royal Black Knights of Ireland, held in Winnipeg, March 4, 1913, a resolution was unanimously adopted: "That we put ourselves on record as unanimously in support of amending the Manitoba School Act to secure a reasonable attendance at school, with an age limit."

Owen R. Lovejoy, National Secretary of the Child Labor Committee of the United States, speaking at St. Stephens Church, Winnipeg, September 14, 1913, said, in noting the lack of a compulsory education law in Manitoba: "I am told that there are thirty thousand children in Manitoba not in school. You can't afford to fasten a deadweight like this upon the nation. It will come back on you."

Rt. Hon. Herbert Samuel, Postmaster-General of Great Britain, at a banquet in his honor before the Montefiore Club, Montreal, Que., October 8, 1913, after stating that he had found during his visit to Manitoba there was no such a thing as a compulsory education law was in force in Manitoba, a condition which he declared to be "lamentable," continued: "I cannot refrain from expressing pain that in one of the largest and most progressive provinces of the Dominion I should find a state of things existing almost a generation behind the rest of the civilized world to-day."

(For daring to express these views, Mr. Samuel was subjected to an incredibly vulgar and abusive attack by Sir Rodmond Roblin, fuller particulars of which will be found on page 75 of this book.)

Principal Peterson, of McGill University, speaking at the same time and place, heartily concurred in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Samuel. "I feel deeply sorry for Manitoba," he said, "and I am sure that no great city can enter her heritage or take care of the children on her streets aright until she has solved the problem of compulsory education."

Rev. Philip Barker, of First Methodist Church, Transcona, at the laying of the corner stone of the \$135,000 public school at Transcona, April 23, 1913, when Hon. G. R. Coldwell officiated, said: "In my opinion the State should look after the education of children. What are we doing in this province? I could give you myself two instances of children over school age who know nothing of the proverbial A B C of education. It is a shame to us in this province that we cannot get compulsory education like other provinces."

Rev. Horace Westwood, pastor of All Souls Unitarian Church, said: "It is a great pity, in fact, it is a crying shame, that in this province this should be considered a question of party politics. I am convinced that many of those who oppose compulsory education are not honest with themselves or with the State."

The Orange Sentinel, February 20, 1913, said: "It is exceedingly regrettable that Sir Rodmond Roblin refuses to consider the adoption of a compulsory educational law in the Province of Manitoba. There can hardly be two opinions on the part of intelligent and impartial men that the recasting of the educational laws of that province is the most important subject with which the legislature can deal."

Venerable Archdeacon Fortin, of Holy Trinity Church, Winnipeg, preaching on education, October 19, 1913, said: "No well-wisher of his country, whatever may be his political affiliation, can consent to allow a large section of the children of the community to grow up in ignorance. Is it not incomprehensible that in this year of grace 1913 there are still so-called statesmen so reactionary, so limited in their outlook, so ignorant of the very fundamentals of right government as to decry and oppose a law of compulsory education? Why, even China has greater foresight, sounder judgment, profounder statesmanship than the ministers that preside over the destinies of Manitoba. The Chinese government has passed a compulsory education law, but we still trail along behind in disgrace, overshadowed by the blind ignorance and stagnation of the dark ages.

D. M. Duncan, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Winnipeg, speaking to the Brotherhood of Central Congregational Church, Winnipeg, April 14, 1912, said: "I have never heard in Manitoba an educationalist of any prominence deny the need of compulsory education. Politicians have done so, but not educationalists."

The Provincial Sunday School Convention at Brandon, November 22, 1912, asked for the amendment of the school laws of Manitoba to provide for "compulsory attendance of all children of school age".

R. W. Craig, School Trustee, and a leading Conservative, lecturing before the Social Service Club of Manitoba University, urged that "the right of every child to a common school education should be made the legal duty of every parent".

The Northwest Teachers' Association at its convention at Gladstone, October, 1913, resolved unanimously "That the association views with concern the fact that large numbers of young people are growing up in the province without the advantages of common school education, and urges on the government, the school boards, the parents and all parties concerned the necessity of co-operation to secure the amelioration of this evil."

Sir Henry Craik, M.P. for the universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen, while in Winnipeg, August 25, 1912, commented strongly on the absence of compulsory education in this province. "I am surprised," he said, "that there should not be compulsory education here, particularly in the cities. I should have thought that the people would have found that out long ago to be in their best interests."

Prof. C. B. Sissons, of Victoria College, Toronto University, in an article in the University Magazine for October, 1912, severely criticized the general educational conditions in Manitoba. Comparing the expen-

ditures for education of Manitoba and British Columbia to the disadvantage of this province, he went on to say: "Even if school buildings and qualified teachers should be provided for all the children of Manitoba there would still remain a defect in the school law, and one which some educationalists are inclined to regard as the gravest of all. Teachers in convention assembled, inspectors in their annual reports and deputations of prominent citizens were for years earnest and insistent in demanding its removal. Lately their efforts have subsided, because each year the legislature witnesses the rejection on a straight party vote of a measure calculated to remedy it. I refer to the absence of a law compelling parents to send their children to school, or convince the State that they are being properly educated elsewhere."

Rev. Dr. D. M. Gordon, Principal of Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., in an address before the Winnipeg Canadian Club in October, 1912, expressed his surprise that the people of Manitoba had not a compulsory education act upon their statute book.

Dr. F. F. Westbrook, president of the University of British Columbia, in the course of an address at the inaugural ceremonies of Principal McLean of Manitoba University, referred to "the dark ages when public schools and compulsory education were unknown."

G. G. Price, head of the technical department, St. John's High School, Winnipeg, speaking before the Winnipeg Teachers' Association, December 12, 1913, strongly urged compulsory education.

Dr. Daniel McIntyre, superintendent of public schools, Winnipeg, in an interview in "The Tribune," June 27, 1912, in discussing statistics showing non-attendance said "That this state of educational conditions for children in Winnipeg is not chargeable to administrative management is well attested by the fact that of 19,750 seats actually provided for children, only 14,149 on an average have been occupied during the present year. This means that 28 seats in every 100 have been empty during each day. The only efficient remedy is found in compulsory education laws for the city."

Rev. J. S. Woodsworth, Winuipeg, addressing the Missionary Education Movement Convention at Whitby, Ont., July 5, 1912, said "In the Province of Manitoba alone there are 30,000 school children not attending any school."

"The Orange Sentinel", May 1, 1913: "In no part of Canada is educational reform so much needed as in Manitoba. There is no law that requires parents to give their children any schooling, and the provision permitting polilingualism not only militates against efficiency in the public schools but actually encourages illiteracy."

SCHOOL INSPECTORS REPORTS SHOW NEED OF COMPULSORY EDUCATION

In the face of the knowledge that Premier Roblin and his whole government have been and still are violently and defiantly opposed to the mention of compulsory education, the school inspectors continue in their annual reports to point to the need of compulsory attendance.

Although in former years the inspectors did not hesitate to designate the need by its right name, they have undoubtedly been influenced by the attitude of the government, and their reports are now notable

rather for what they hint at than what they actually say. The following excerpts from inspectorial reports, in view of the known anxiety of the government to have no arguments provided for compulsory education, are all the more significant:

From the report of the Manitoba Department of Education for the year ending December 31, 1911, the following extracts are taken:

"Speaking generally, the attendance is improving. There is a good average in the towns and villages. In the rural schools the worst attendance was during the months of September and October, partly accounted for by the bad weather; but there are quite a number of districts where many of the children are not enrolled, and where the average attendance is very low."—Inspector Walker.

"The attendance is improving somewhat. There are in this division a number of rural schools where the entire enrollment seems to be present on all occasions almost. Unfortunately there are a few at the other extreme."—Inspector Hooper.

"The total number of children enrolled in this division (No. 9) is 1,720. I feel confident that besides these there are over 200 children of school age who have attended no school during the year. The average attendance I estimate at about 40 per cent. of the school population for the entire division, and it is in this matter of irregularity of attendance that our schools are finding themselves helpless. The children are not to blame. Any remedy to be successful must be one that will stir the parents to action."—Inspector Herriott.

In the report of the Manitoba Department of Education for the year ending June 30, 1913, tabled in the legislature on Dec. 11, 1913, appear the following statements by school inspectors:

"The average attendance has slightly improved. It is now about 50 per cent. of the total number of children enrolled and a fraction less than 40 per cent. of the total number of children of school age. Figures from several districts show that quite a number of children of school age are not enrolled."—Inspector Walker.

"Wherever a school is well attended, and in the charge of a teacher well qualified and experienced, there is good work being done. On the other hand, where the attendance is small and irregular and the teacher defective in education or practice, the work is poor, and the lamentable fact is that most of the rural schools, especially in the 'back country' come under the latter-named class."—Inspector Bellon.

"While I note many improvements in the rural schools, these improvements must be described as local; the general condition remains the same. Lack of numbers in the school and lack of interest on the part of ratepayers continue in many schools."—Inspector Morrison.

"The attendance at the time of my visit ranged from very good to very poor, dependent on road and weather conditions or the season of the year. The average attendance on the whole seems to have improved. There are still some large areas without school accommodation. This is particularly true of the eastern portions of McCreary municipality, where there is a large Galician settlement, and where there must be nearly one hundred children of school age unprovided for."—Inspector Herriott.

"Owing to the distance to be covered, the sparseness of settlement in some parts, and the almost entire lack of roads in the entire districts, it is a big task to cover the whole territory every six months, but I have succeeded fairly well. The last time I failed to reach only four schools, four were closed when I called and four were unable to obtain teachers throughout the year."—Inspector Hartley.

There is every reason to believe that, apart from the comparatively few districts where consolidation has been effected, enrolment and attendance conditions have in recent years grown worse instead of better. Yet in the inspectorial reports for 1907 appear, amongst others, the following statements:

"There seems to be a growing feeling in favor of compulsory attendance, and no class of people would welcome it more warmly than the teachers."—Inspector Parr.

"The regular attendance, and in not a few cases the entire lack of attendance, is still the most serious problem before us."—Inspector Campbell.

"Compulsory education would be a great boon."—Inspector Fallis.

"Even in the towns a measure of compulsion would be of great benefit."—Inspector Wright.

"The only remedy appears to be compulsory attendance."—Inspector Friesen.

THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT AND AMENDMENTS OF 1914

For nearly ten years the Roblin Government has opposed compulsory education. Its objections have been manifold. It has argued that compulsory education has been useless and ineffective wherever tried; the simple answer to this is that the contention is absolutely untrue. Then the Roblin Government has argued that compulsory education in Manitoba would be unconstitutional, or that to pass such a measure would be to reopen a bitter and violent school controversy. This may best be answered by asking the question: Shall Manitoba then never have compulsory education?

Again, the Roblin government has argued that compulsory education is unnecessary, as school consolidation has improved school attendance. A complete reply to this is that compulsory education and school consolidation are not alternatives. Besides this in many parts of the province school consolidation is far from being practical.

Another favorite argument of the Roblin Government against compulsory education was that the province had already something better than compulsory education, viz., a truancy act. On examination, however, this truancy act proved to be the children's act. The latter is an act, which, up to the 1914 session of the Manitoba legislature, had to do solely with neglected and dependent children. The administration of the act was not under the Department of Education, but under that of the attorney-general. No mention of the truancy act or of its operation had ever appeared in the annual reports of the Minister of Education.

Considered as a compulsory education law the children's act was a crude and clumsy farce. It contained no provision whatever for the punishment of parents who failed to send their children to school. Although

in existence for seven years not a single parent had ever been proceeded against under it for a clear case of this kind. Nothing in the act said that children must attend school, nor for how long or what excuses would be valid for absence from school. In Winnipeg this precious "truancy act" had not prevented thousands of children year in and year out from being unenrolled in any school. Outside of Winnipeg there is no pretence even of enforcing this "truancy act."

But at Minnedosa, as recently as Nov. 7, 1913, Premier Roblin solemnly stated that this farcical "truancy act" was more effective than any compulsory education act in Canada or the United States. However, Premier Roblin quickly changed his mind. Within a month or two of declaring at Minnedosa that the "truancy act" was more effective than any compulsory education act in Canada or the United States Premier Roblin was preparing with his colleagues elaborate amendments to the act.

On Feb. 20, 1914, these amendments were passed by the legislature. suggestions by the Liberals towards making the act a real measure of compulsory education being voted down. Popular feeling in favor of compulsory education had become almost irresistible, and the Roblin government was forced to do some window dressing. Mr. Coldwell, who had opposed compulsory education for years, and who had used against it every argument he could think of, suddenly promised drastic legislation. He declared he would not only fine every parent who failed to send his children to school, but would also send to detention homes all persistent truants, force attendance returns from all the private schools, and drag-net the province with "trained truant officers."

To the children's act there have undoubtedly been added clauses which at first glance have an air of compulsory education. But although, like other Coldwell amendments, these clauses have been cleverly and ingeniously contrived, they are open to grave suspicion. Apart from the question whether there is any honest intention to operate the new clauses the amended children's act, as it stands, is open to the following serious objections:—

(1) It is something outside and separate from the public schools act, and it is not a special truancy act, but an act which still has to do, in the main, with neglected and dependent children.

(2) It contains no plain statement that every child of a certain age must attend some school. Compulsion, if any, is only to be found by reading, in conjunction, detached portions of the act.

(3) It is not incumbent upon the government or upon any other authority within the province to appoint a single truant officer.

(4) It specifies no reasons as valid excuses for absence from school.

(5) It does not permit any school board within the province to appoint, control and pay, truant officers. Thus neither the Winnipeg school board nor the Brandon school board can appoint truant officers.

(6) It leaves the appointment of truant officers in the hands of the Department of Education. This means that the appointments will be political. Already men without the slightest educational qualifi-

lections have been appointed truant officers as a reward for political service.

(7) It allows any truant officer to give an unlimited permit to any child under fourteen to be at work during school hours.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION LAWS IN OTHER PROVINCES.

Nova Scotia—Children between six and sixteen years must attend school 120 days in the school year with provisions for exemption under certain circumstances.

New Brunswick—Since 1903 the province has had an act providing for the compulsory attendance of children between the ages of seven and twelve.

Ontario—Every child between the age of seven and fourteen must attend school for the full term each year, unless he has passed the entrance examination for high schools or under certain specified conditions. Employment of children during school hours is prohibited.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—The attendance at school of children between the ages of seven and twelve years inclusive, is compulsory for a period of at least sixteen weeks each year, eight weeks of which time must be consecutive.

British Columbia—Every child from the age of seven to fourteen inclusive, must attend some school or be otherwise educated for six months in each year.

Prince Edward Island—All children between the ages of eight and thirteen must attend school at least twelve weeks every school year, six weeks of which must be consecutive.

It is to be noted that practically every Canadian province has a children's protection act. But in no case is such an act the compulsory education statute of the province. Where compulsory education is in force in Canada the compulsory clauses are either an integral portion of the public schools act, or form a special compulsory attendance act. The children's protection act is something quite apart from these.

THE BILINGUAL SCHOOLS.

Although grossly and wilfully misrepresented by Conservative speakers and writers the Liberal position on the bilingual schools is clear and well defined. The Liberals contend, in brief, that while certain privileges may reasonably be granted to the French and other non-English-speaking nationalities in regard to their mother tongue, the teaching of the English language must be a prime consideration in all the public schools.

In Manitoba there are at the present time some 1,450 public schools, of which one-fourth are bilingual schools. There are in the public schools of Manitoba 2,950 teachers, about one-seventh of whom are bilingual school teachers. For the most part these bilingual schools lie in compact areas inhabited by non-English nationalities. The contention of the Liberals, supported by a wealth of evidence, is that the teaching of English in the bilingual schools of Manitoba, taken as a whole, has been and is to-day inefficient and inadequate.

In the French, Polish and Ruthenian settlements of Manitoba the English language is but poorly understood and indifferently spoken by the children and by a considerable number of the adult population. The Liberals contend that this condition represents not only a wrong inflicted upon these children individually, but a prejudice to the entire province and to the entire dominion. For this condition of things means that the French children and the Polish and Ruthenian children are being unprepared not alone to make their own way in life, but unprepared also for the responsibilities of Canadian citizenship and the burdens of Canadian nationality.

Of the bilingual schools of Manitoba some 150, or nearly one-half, are French Canadian. The vast majority of the French bilingual schools are one-roomed rural schools, for the most part inefficient as regards the teaching of English. Perhaps the best insight into the conditions prevailing in these schools is afforded by a remark made by "Le Manitoba," the personal organ of the Hon. Joseph Bernier, a member of the Roblin government. Said "Le Manitoba":—

"If, unfortunately, local difficulties, scarcity of teachers or unforeseen circumstances, necessitate one of the two languages being momentarily abandoned in the French schools, it will not be the French language."

It will not be necessary to say much regarding the German bilingual schools. Practically all of these are Mennonite schools. Very distinct privileges were given the Mennonites by the government when they settled in Manitoba in the seventies. The Mennonites preferred at the outset to maintain their own private schools. But they are slowly and steadily organizing public schools in their districts. Already some sixty public schools in which Mennonite children predominate have been formed. Some sixty private Mennonite schools still remain. In the Mennonite public schools English is being taught with reasonable efficiency, and, what is perhaps more important, with entire goodwill.

In the case of the Ruthenian and Polish bilingual schools, the problem has been greatly aggravated. In dealing with these schools, and with the settlements in which they exist, the Roblin government has shown criminal cowardice and negligence. It has permitted the Ruthenian and Polish bilingual schools in many cases to be prostituted to propaganda. This is of two distinct kinds, religious and racial. These two groups are bitterly opposed to each other. For the most part the Slav bilingual teachers of Manitoba are young Ruthenians or Poles, possessing no doubt many excellent qualities, but unable, in many cases, to speak English either fluently or perfectly. Training schools, a Polish school in Winnipeg, and a Ruthenian school in Brandon, have been improvised for the benefit of the Slav bilingual teachers. Few of the young men who go to these schools have had high school training. The two schools, as their principals have admitted freely in their annual reports, have never been equipped or staffed to do efficient work.

The Liberal policy is to see that English is adequately taught, and for this purpose to see that an adequate supply of competent teachers is available.

NEGLECT OF EDUCATION OF NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN.

The Roblin government has been criminally indifferent to the education of large numbers of the non-English-speaking children of Manitoba. During the winter of 1912-1913 a "Free Press" staff correspondent made an extended trip through the principal Polish and Ruthenian districts of the province for the purpose of studying the educational conditions obtaining. The conditions discovered were almost beyond belief. In part the report of the correspondent was as follows:—

(1) In the large Slav area north of Teulon and west of Gimli were found 14 Slav bilingual schools, of which ten were open. The number of children of school age in the settlement was from 1,200 to 1,500. In attendance at the ten schools open were 220 children.

(2) In the Slav and German settlement north of the town of Beausejour were found seven schools, not all of which were open, and a school population of 800 children. The children in attendance numbered 90.

(3) In the large Slav and German settlements north and south of the village of Whitemouth were found five schools, four of which were open. The school population was 1,400. In attendance at the four open schools were 90 children.

(4) On the Teulon line of the C. P. R., between Teulon and Arborg, a distance of about forty miles, seven stations were found, most of them established villages, all without schools. At Komarno, one of these villages, there were at least 100 children of school age.

The Roblin government neither directly nor through its press challenged the truthfulness of the above report. Since these facts were made known, schools have been built at one or two of the villages on the Teulon line, and two new schools have been built south of Whitemouth, though up to the present (April, 1914) they have not been operated.

The condition of things revealed by the investigation may be summed up as follows:—Scandalous lack of schools in the Polish and Ruthenian settlements of Manitoba; very irregular attendance at the relatively few existing schools; many schools closed at any given time through lack of teachers or other causes; child labor general both on the land and in factories on border of settlements; special needs of the settlers, educational and otherwise, criminally neglected; school trustees, poorly acquainted with English, expected to understand and administer the school law in precisely the same way as trustees in old and well-settled English-speaking districts; political heelers in the guise of school organizers instructed to corrupt and debauch the settlers; children generally unfamiliar with English and unable to speak it.

On Jan. 2, 1902, a delegation of prominent Winnipeg citizens, composed of such men as the late Sir William Whyte, J. A. M. Aikins, the late Rev. Dr. Sparling and Rev. Dr. C. W. Gordon, waited upon the Roblin government, and asked that special financial assistance be given to the Slav population of Manitoba for the purpose of establishing schools.

Premier Roblin, who received the delegation, promised definitely that if the Dominion government would forward to the province some \$200,000, representing arrears of interest on school lands account, he would grant the request of the delegation. The premier said:—"If we got that money we would organize schools."

A few months later the Dominion government transferred the money in question. The sum sent to the Manitoba government amounted to \$224,115. But Premier Roblin has never kept his promise, and nothing has been done to meet the special needs of the Slav settlers in the matter of schools. To-day there are more Slav children growing up in ignorance and more areas without school accommodation than there were in 1902, when the delegation waited upon the local government. The total Slav population of Manitoba has grown from 15,000 in that year to 50,000 at the present time.

It is true that two training schools, one for Polish teachers and the other for Ruthenian teachers, have been established. These schools, however, have never been properly equipped, and have never been in a position to turn out efficient teachers. Nor have they ever furnished the necessary number of teachers. All told these two training schools, since their establishment some six or seven years ago, have turned out 92 teachers, and of these 92 only some 70 are still teaching in Manitoba. But there are at least 120 Slav schools in the province! The only interest which the Roblin government has ever had in these two training schools has been their supposed value as a vote-getter amongst the Slav population.

The table given below shows in the first column the total amounts spent annually by the Roblin government in grants to primary schools. In the second column are shown the amounts received by the province from the Ottawa school lands fund, which is earmarked for the primary schools, and in the third column are to be found the net amounts provided by the Roblin government itself for grants to primary schools:—

	Total amount of grants towards elementary education.	Received from Ottawa school lands fund for elementary education.	Net amount provided by Roblin government towards elementary education.
1900	\$211,346	\$ 19,161	\$192,185
1901	110,509,	22,915	87,594
1902	218,797	254,387*
1903	151,614	28,278	123,336
1904	178,525	77,224	101,301
1905	214,968	130,721	84,247
1906	204,853	76,212	128,641
1907	213,497	111,572	101,925
1908	236,173	114,185	121,988
1909	251,743	166,056	85,687
1910	250,538	208,157	51,381
1911	272,145	183,547	88,598
1912**	299,846	122,692	177,153
	<hr/> \$2,823,554	<hr/> \$1,515,108	

*Of this sum \$224,115 represented arrears of interest as explained.
**Eleven months ending Nov. 30, 1912.

It will be seen from the above table that while \$2,823,554 has been spent in grants to primary schools by the Roblin government, no less

than \$1,515,108 of this sum has been received from the Dominion government. Thus the net amount spent by the Roblin government on primary education since it came into office has been \$1,308,446, or \$100,649 per annum.

During the last ten years of the Greenway government, 1890-1899, the total amount spent in grants to primary schools was \$1,260,969, and the amount received from the Ottawa school lands fund was \$106,748. Thus the Greenway government itself provided during those ten years for grants to primary schools a sum of \$1,154,221, or \$115,422 per annum, as against \$100,649 per annum provided by the Roblin government with an enormously increased population and enormously increased revenue.

Manitoba could well have afforded to render special financial assistance in the education of the Slav children of the province. The money spent would have been a direct investment in Canadian citizenship and Canadian nationhood.

ILLITERACY IN MANITOBA.

The need of compulsory education in Manitoba is illustrated in the fact that Brandon and Winnipeg have the undesirable distinction of having a higher percentage of illiterates than any other cities in Canada of more than 7,000 population, with the single exception of Victoria, B.C. In the latter city the high percentage of 13.33 is accounted for to a large extent by the very large proportion of Orientals living in that city. Brandon has a percentage of 12.41 illiterates, Winnipeg has 9.80. These figures are taken from the Dominion census of 1911, Toronto with 3.67, Vancouver with 5.32, Hamilton with 4.56, Quebec with 8.38 and Montreal with 9.70 are large cities that put Winnipeg to shame, while Calgary with 5.87, Regina with 6.76 and Edmonton with 6.07 are cities of the neighboring Western provinces that only emphasize the undesirable distinction of the cities of Manitoba.

The whole province stands third among the nine provinces, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan only showing a slightly larger percentage. Manitoba also has the distinction of having shown a smaller decrease of illiteracy in the ten years preceding the last census than any one of the other provinces. The decrease in Manitoba is shown as 1.24 in Ontario it was 2.24, in Quebec 5.05, in Nova Scotia 3.91, in Alberta 17.84 in Saskatchewan 21.41, while in the whole of Canada the decrease was 3.85. The census also shows the interesting and convincing fact that in Manitoba the percentage of illiteracy among foreign born males from 5 years to 21 is considerably more than among the foreign born adults. The official figures show that one out of every four foreign born males in Manitoba between the ages of 5 and 21 cannot read and write.

THE COLDWELL AMENDMENTS

In the legislative session of 1912, on the motion of Hon. G. R. Coldwell, three clauses, ever since known as the Coldwell amendments, were added to the Public Schools Act. Their text is as follows:

- (1) The word "school," wherever it occurs in this Act, shall mean and include any and every school building, school room or department in a school building owned by a public school district, presided over by a teacher or teachers.

- (2) It shall be the duty of every public school board in this province to provide school accommodation according to the requirements of "the Public Schools Act," when so requested by the parents or guardians of children of school age under "the Public Schools Act".
- (3) Section 218, chapter 143, revised statutes of Manitoba, 1902, was intended to mean and does mean a teacher for the children of the petitioners and of the same religious denomination as the petitioners.

On April 4, 1912, the bill containing the above clauses was reported to the legislature from the Law Amendments Committee and considered by the legislature in committee of the whole. It was then reported back to the house, after a lengthy and interesting discussion. At an evening session of the same day the bill finally passed. The Coldwell amendments were thus before the legislature for less than forty-eight hours.

The Immediate Reason for the Amendments

How the Coldwell amendments were designed to operate may be a matter involved in much darkness, but the reason for their being passed is plain enough. They were passed to tide the Dominion Conservative government over a crisis in connection with the Manitoba Boundaries Bill. When this bill was before the Dominion House, in the spring of 1912, the Quebec Nationalists demanded the addition of a provision providing for separate schools. The Borden government proceeded to placate the Nationalists by promising that Premier Roblin would at once do something for the Manitoba Catholics.

. It is not probable that the question would have become acute at Ottawa if the Quebec Provincial Elections had not been pending. It was thus to help the Quebec Conservatives in the general election of May, 1912, that the Coldwell amendments were really passed. The most tangible proof of this is a letter addressed to the Quebec Conservatives shortly before the election by the French-Canadian members of the Manitoba Legislature—Joseph Bernier, Aime Benard and Albert Prefontaine. This letter reads, in part, as follows:

"At last we are freed from that double tax which has weighed so heavily and so unjustly upon us. Thanks to the man whom you have come to honor by your presence, one of the most cruel griefs, the most crying injustice of the iniquitous Laurier-Greenway settlement, is at last removed."

This letter was dated April 13, 1912, just one week after the Coldwell amendments became law. The letter was addressed to prominent Quebec Conservatives who visited Manitoba at the time to attend a banquet in honor of Sir Rodmond Roblin. The relief referred to had direct reference to the Coldwell amendments.

The Discussion in the Legislature

The only reason which has ever been vouchsafed by Premier Roblin and Minister of Education Coldwell for the passing of these amendments is that they were designed to promote the taking over by the Winnipeg School Board of the Catholic schools of Winnipeg.

Premier Roblin, when asked in the legislature on March 31, 1912—four days before the amendments were introduced and passed — by T. H. Johnson whether the government proposed to introduce further

amendments to the school law, said: "I think the Minister of Education has several. I have not read them, but I understand he has several amendments." Since then the Premier has, on different occasions, made the general statement that the amendments were designed to take over the Catholic schools, but he has never explained in any way how this was to be done.

Mr. Coldwell himself, when he gave notice of the amendments to the Law Amendments Committee, stated that their object was to make it easy for the Winnipeg School Board to take over the Catholic schools of the city. Two days later, in the legislature, at the beginning of a lengthy debate on the amendments, Mr. Coldwell affected to believe that the new clauses had reference only to school grants. The following dialogue took place between the Minister and Mr. Johnson:

"Mr. Johnson—Will the Minister of Education tell us in what respect the Act is effected in addition to the matter of grants?

"Mr. Coldwell—I don't know any other effect outside of grants.

"Mr. Johnson—Then the amendments would be limited to that.

"Mr. Coldwell—No, I will make the definition as wide as I can make it.

"Mr. Johnson—The honorable gentleman told us the clause was dealing only with grants.

"Mr. Coldwell—It may effect some other things, but I cannot tell what they are at the present time."

It proved very difficult to get Mr. Coldwell to say anything about the amendments during this debate. However, he did declare that the amendment did not permit the segregation of children according to religious belief. He also declared that the amendments contemplated all public schools using the same text books, employing the same class of teachers, and being inspected by the same inspectors as then obtained. As a result of Mr. Coldwell pledging his word explicitly that the amendments would change nothing in the present working of the Public Schools Act and that the situation would practically remain unchanged, the Liberals on this occasion did not vote against the amendments.

Negotiations with the Winnipeg School Board

During a large part of 1912 Mr. Coldwell used his best endeavors to get the Winnipeg School Board to try and work his amendments. Numerous interviews took place. Mr. Coldwell, however, could not satisfy the School Board that the amendments bearing his name legally entitled the Board to take over the Catholic schools in the way the Minister wished them to be taken over.

An important development was the petitioning, on December 10, 1912, of the Winnipeg School Board by the Catholic ratepayers of Winnipeg to take over their eight Catholic day-schools. In substance the petition asked that the Catholic schools be taken over under an arrangement similar to that existing in portions of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—by which Catholic children would be segregated in these schools and taught by their own teachers. The petitioners stated that they were

advised that no legal difficulties stood in the way and they closed their petition with a request that the Catholic school buildings be leased by the Board upon fair terms and maintained by the Board.

The petition of the Catholic ratepayers was submitted by the Winnipeg School Board to J. H. Munson, a prominent Winnipeg lawyer, for a legal opinion. Mr. Munson delivered his opinion on March 10, 1913. His most important pronouncements were that it would be a breach of the Public Schools Act to restrict any school, either as to teachers or pupils, to one religious denomination, and that the wearing of religious garb in the public schools was contrary to the school law.

Mr. Bernier Explains the Amendment

An interesting development in the matter of the Coldwell amendments came immediately after the publication of the Munson opinion. On March 19, 1913, "Le Manitoba," the personal organ of Hon. Joseph Bernier, did what no one on the government side of the house, or for that matter anyone else, had hitherto attempted to do, viz., explain how the Coldwell amendments were designed to work.

The article in "Le Manitoba" remains perhaps the most important document in connection with the whole controversy over the Coldwell amendments. For within a few weeks of the appearance of the article in Mr. Bernier's personal organ, Mr. Bernier was taken into the Roblin Cabinet, and he is at the present time (April, 1914) a member of that Cabinet.

Mr. Bernier's organ stated that the purpose of the Coldwell amendments was to re-establish separate schools in Manitoba. It explained that the amendments had been drafted for this purpose by "A Master Hand". It contended that by the amendments the segregation of school children according to religious belief had become legal and it ridiculed the opinion of Mr. Munson that the wearing of religious garb in the public schools was illegal. The most important passages of the article in Mr. Bernier's organ are as follows:

"As for the segregation of pupils by Protestants and Catholics, we maintain without the least hesitation that it has become legally possible by the Coldwell law. It is true that clause 220 of the School Act says that 'No separation of pupils by religious denominations shall take place during the secular school work,' but this clause is only a general regulation and one which must be considered as virtually repealed by sub-section (r) of section 1 of the Coldwell amendments, whenever the Catholics are in a position to take advantage of section 218 of the School Act.

"If, then, the Catholics have the right of demanding (Clause 218) a Catholic teacher for every class of 40 or 25 pupils (sub-section (r) and (s) of the Coldwell amendments) such teacher is at the exclusive disposition of the Catholic children. He cannot, in fact, by the terms of the law, be engaged for the Catholic children and at the same time teach the other children. And it follows from that logically and inevitably that these classes of Catholic children will form separate classes. And if all the classes in the school contain 40 or 25 Catholic children, the entire school will be under the direction of Catholic teachers and will be a separate school."

Note: Sub-sections (r) and (s) mentioned in these extracts are respectively clauses (1) and (2) of the Coldwell amendments as quoted above.

In a pastoral letter read in St. Boniface Cathedral on Sunday, May 4, 1913, Archbishop Langevin said that the Coldwell amendments were the result of negotiations between the Catholics and the Roblin Government.

In the meantime widespread distrust of the government had been created amongst the Orange Order through the passing of the Coldwell amendments. On the other hand, the Catholic organs of Winnipeg and elsewhere were hotly denouncing the government for having "fooled" them and for having failed to put into practice their own law. Father Portelance, of the Sacred Heart Church, Winnipeg, said that Mr. Coldwell had made himself a laughing-stock.

Mr. Coldwell's Explanations

At Brandon on July 12, 1913, Mr. Coldwell was given a very bad quarter of an hour by a large gathering of Orangemen who demanded to know the whole story of the Coldwell amendments. The Minister entirely failed to explain how the amendments were designed to work and he afforded no information with regard to them.

Mr. Coldwell stated at this Brandon meeting that he was absolutely opposed to separate schools and would resign rather than re-introduce them. However, Mr. Joseph Bernier, now a member of the Cabinet, through his organ "Le Manitoba," at once undertook to explain that Mr. Coldwell, although he might be opposed to separate schools "in the strict sense of the word," was not opposed to, but entirely favored, the kind of separate school which it was proposed to introduce under the Coldwell amendments.

Mr. Andrews' Opinion

Mention must be made of another legal opinion upon the Coldwell amendments, viz., that of A. J. Andrews, K.C. This opinion was given at the request of Mr. Coldwell. Surely outside of comic opera the spectacle had never before been seen of a responsible Minister of the Crown asking a private citizen to explain a law which he (the Minister) introduced into and sponsored in Parliament. Mr. Andrews is a prominent Winnipeg Conservative, and was, in fact, a Roblin candidate at the general election of 1910. The Andrews opinion was asked for by Mr. Coldwell in a letter to Mr. Andrews dated April 17, 1913. The opinion was delivered to Mr. Coldwell by Mr. Andrews in a letter dated April 28, 1913. But it was not till August 12, 1913, over three months later, that this opinion, through the medium of Dr. James McKenty, representative of the Catholic ratepayers, was submitted to the Winnipeg School Board.

While stating generally that the School Board was empowered, under the Coldwell amendments, to take over the Catholic schools, the Andrews opinion made no specific statement regarding the segregation of children according to religious belief. However, it did say clearly that the wearing of religious garb in the public schools was permissible. The School Board has not felt itself justified in taking any action on the strength of the Andrews opinion.

Liberals Move the Repeal

On January 23, 1914, T. H. Johnson introduced a bill into the Manitoba legislature repealing the Coldwell amendments. Later in the session Mr. Johnson, on moving the second reading of his bill, appealed to Mr. Coldwell to explain his "mysterious" amendments. Mr. Coldwell, however, failed once more to shed any light on the manner in which his amendments were designed to operate. On February 5, 1914, Mr. Coldwell killed Mr. Johnson's bill by moving a six months' hoist. The Liberals divided the house on the question and all present, with the exception of William Molloy, member for La Verandrye, voted for repeal.

It may be pointed out that the Coldwell amendments do not refer simply to Winnipeg and Brandon, but to every school district in Manitoba.

LARGER GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS

On February 3, 1913, in the debate on the budget, Mr. Norris criticized the policy of the government in its aid to schools and argued that the present grant of \$130 per teacher per year should be increased by at least \$50. Dr. McConnell, Morden, suggested \$1 per teacher per teaching day. Premier Roblin scorned the suggestion, stating that in any event the finances of the province could not stand the strain. Hon. G. R. Coldwell, Minister of Education, declared that increased grants would not improve the situation and blamed the people themselves if the schools were poor. He charged that if the grants were increased the people would "live off the grants" and do nothing for themselves.

The Liberals by the resolution adopted by the convention, March, 1914, are pledged "to increase the efficiency of rural schools by much more liberal grants from the legislature (not less than \$200 per teacher per annum in rural schools), and by more careful supervision".

KARMANSKY'S APPEAL TO RACE PREJUDICE

In the building up of its political machine the Roblin government has had neither respect nor consideration for educational progress or efficiency. Political advantage has ever been the guiding principle of the Roblin government in educational affairs, from the university down to the primary schools.

In the hope of strengthening itself with the Ruthenian population the Roblin government appointed last summer as teacher in the Brandon Ruthenian Training School, one Professor P. Karmansky. When he received this job Karmansky had been in Manitoba, and in fact in Canada, only a few weeks and he was unable to speak English.

Almost simultaneously with the engagement of Karmansky there appeared in Winnipeg a new Roblin organ, printed in Ruthenian, and called "Canada". It was and is still published in the Charles H. Forrester Block, in which building are also housed the Provincial Police Department and the Provincial Liquor License Department, as well as many other offices of the Provincial government.

The first issue of "Canada" came out with a large picture of Sir Rodmond Roblin on the front page, and a biography of the Premier was promised for the next issue. Advertisements of both the Roblin and the Borden governments held prominent position. Conservative organizer Stefanik appeared as the president of the publishing company; and Paul Gigejczuk appeared as vice-president. Both Stefanik and Gigejczuk have been for years Roblin workers amongst the Ruthenian population.

From the very beginning, Karmansky, from the sheltered position of a government job, has contributed political articles to "Canada," and in these articles he has abused the Liberals in violent and vulgar language. A complete stranger to the province, he bounded at once into the political arena, raising a fiery cross and preaching loudly and wildly that the Liberals were the inveterate and implacable foes of the Ruthenian population and that the Roblin government was the saviour and protector of his people. Here are some samples of Karmansky's attack upon the Liberals in the Roblin organ "Canada":

"The Ukrainian people withheld numerous hordes of Mongolian races—Magyars, Tartars, Turks, etc. They remained intact from the psycho-physical and linguistic points of view. Despite all the century-long efforts of Russians, Poles and Magyars to assimilate the Ruthenians, they did not succeed.

"Even such measures to achieve it as jails, deportations to Siberia and bayonets did not bring about the desired results. What was for centuries and is impossible for those guardians of ours to achieve in Europe will sure be impossible for the Canadian Liberals. . . .

"The Liberals may proclaim a crusade on all the non-English nationalities, especially on the Galicians; they may insinuate that our people are savages and less civilized than the Indians, civilized by Englishmen; they may close down our schools and disperse our teachers; they may state on every page of their Free Press, and other papers, that they will not rest till they have utterly exterminated our nationality, which means not until they have changed all our settlers into English; they may speak ill of our girls, and even give them into the hands of 'cowboys' appointed as teachers in our schools, to satisfy their animal passions—all this disappears under the catching and beautiful name: Liberals."

The writings of Karmansky in the Roblin organ "Canada," if they have not been actually seditious, have been subversive and destructive of Canadian citizenship and Canadian nationality. More than once in his writings Karmansky has referred to English-speaking Canadians as "foreigners". So, for instance, in the following:

"Foreigners are spitting in our eyes, are doing with us as they please, shutting our children out of our schools, doing away with our mother tongue—and we have to submit to it in silence."

On one occasion Karmansky declared that the destiny of the Ruthenians of Canada was to found an independent nation, and he threatened that if the Ruthenians were interferred with in fulfilling that destiny there would be war. Karmansky wrote:

"We came to Canada not for the purpose of being the dirt beneath the feet of other nations or to be slaves to the ruling nationality and to be submerged in the English sea. We look for an opportunity to live like one of the many independent Canadian nations, united by the idea of a common all-Canadian welfare. We can Canadianize ourselves only to that point. Beyond that we will not move one step. . . .

"We will find in free Canada either that which is refused to us by the Poles, Russians and Hungarians; either we will be sincere Canadians and help to build the temple of all-Canadian welfare, or we will proclaim war for the purpose of preserving our life. One or the other."

This is the kind of man that the Roblin government, for political ends, has taken unto itself, sheltered and subsidized. Is it tolerable that the people of Manitoba who are assisting laboriously and patiently in the building up of a Canadian citizenship, and a Canadian nationality should have their efforts prejudiced and frustrated by men of the Karmansky type who are eating their own bread?

Hon. George R. Coldwell, Minister of Education, speaking in Brandon, in April, 1914, at a meeting of Ruthenian electors, called together by Organizer Stefanik, gave Karmansky a certificate of character. He said:

"With great pleasure I have appointed this year as a teacher of the Ruthenian language and history Mr. Karmansky, and I am sure that the students will greatly benefit from this teacher's lessons, who is working with self-sacrifice. The 'noise-makers' from the Opposition attacked Mr. Karmansky in Parliament, accusing him of supposed inflammatory actions, and demanded his removal.

"I was glad to have defended Mr. Karmansky, whose sacrifices for the school I appreciate, and would like to see Canada getting more men of his type.

"I am sure that you appreciate my good intentions to serve the Ruthenians, and will help me to be elected during the coming elections. I assure you that I will work for you the same in the future as I have done in the past."

Temperance

THE LIBERAL POLICY

(Adopted by the Liberal Convention, March 27, 1914)

That this Convention condemns the administration of the liquor license laws as grossly inefficient, corrupt and partisan, and declares that the Roblin Government is responsible therefor, and should on this account, and on account of its opposition to all proposals of reform, be condemned by all citizens who believe in moral progress and honest enforcement of the law.

That the Liberal Party, recognizing the grave evils, disorders and corrupt influences associated with the liquor traffic, especially the bar sale of liquor and the treating custom, re-affirms its declarations of unqualified sympathy with the temperance cause and pledges itself:

- (1) To pass an Act for the abolition of the bar, to be prepared by the recognized temperance forces and to submit such Act to a referendum, which Act, if endorsed by the electors, shall be put into operation and shall have the hearty support of the Liberal Party in its thorough enforcement.
- (2) To amend the Liquor License Act so as to ensure a large reduction in the number of liquor licenses, the abolition of proprietary club licenses and the prohibition of the sale of liquor on Christmas Day, Good Friday and Thanksgiving Day.
- (3) To amend the local option law by providing that any municipality shall have the power: (a) To limit, reduce or abolish any class of liquor licenses as well as to shorten the hours of sale; (b) that resident voters only shall have the right to vote; (c) that no liquor licenses shall be issued where a local option by-law has been carried and subsequently quashed on technical grounds.

SALIENT FACTS OF GOVERNMENT'S RECORD ON TEMPERANCE

July, 1899—The Manitoba Conservative Convention adopts this as the nineteenth plank of their platform: "That a measure be adopted to give effect to the will of the people regarding prohibition of the liquor traffic, which measure should go as far in the direction of prohibition as the powers of the Province will allow."

June, 1900—The Legislature adopts bill introduced by Hugh John Macdonald providing for the prohibition of liquor in Manitoba, to come into effect June 1, 1901. In introducing the bill, Hugh John Macdonald said: "The moment that (prohibition) plank went into the platform and we as a party went before the country for support of that plank coupled with others, my course was clear: to carry out honestly the pledge made to the people."

February, 1901—Act passed by the Manitoba Legislature extending the time for the coming into effect of the Prohibition Act to June 1, 1902, to permit the Privy Council to hear the appeal.

November 22, 1901—Privy Council hands down decision declaring the Act wholly within the powers of the Legislature.

Roblin Repudiates Prohibition Measure

November 29, 1901—Mr. Roblin, while in Toronto, gives interview to "The World." Says that the Prohibition Act was not the Act of the present government and that there was no interest shown in the bill when it was before the House. He denied that prohibition had been the main plank in the platform of Mr. Macdonald.

January 6, 1902—Mr. Roblin gives out interview declaring that it was necessary to ascertain that there is in the Province a sufficient weight of public opinion to justify the attempt to enforce the provisions of the Liquor Act.

January 12, 1902—Hon. Mr. Rogers, in address to Winnipeg Conservatives, announces that a referendum must be held before the Liquor Act can be put into force.

January 21, 1902—R. P. Roblin writes to W. R. Mulock, denouncing the Hugh John Macdonald bill as "no Prohibition Bill whatever."

January 22, 1902—R. P. Roblin writes to Rev. Mr. Holling: "The government and the Conservative Party are willing to go farther in the cause of temperance, true temperance, than any government that has ever been in the Province before, but those supporting the government are not in favor of free whisky as provided under the Liquor Act without the people themselves so declaring it."

The Referendum of 1902

February 19, 1902—Act providing for referendum introduced into the Legislature by Mr. C. H. Campbell. Speaking to his motion, Mr. Campbell said that "the question of prohibition was not mentioned on the platform at the last election so far as I heard or as I was told." He further declared that it would be the height of unwise to put this Act into force without consulting the people. Further, Mr. Campbell said: "Supposing the Act is defeated, then the position of the government is this, that we should call in those who are interested in this temperance reform and ask them what is the wisest course to pursue, the adoption of the North Carolina system, the Gothenberg system, the Russian system or any of the various systems in vogue through the world."

April 2, 1902—Referendum on Hugh John Macdonald Act results in defeat of the measure. The vote: For Act, 15,607; against, 22,464; majority against Act, 6,857; total votes cast, 38,071; total number of votes on electoral list, 73,897.

April 23, 1902—The Dominion Alliance by resolution declares that "in the whole history of this Province no other election, municipal, provincial or federal, was ever characterized by such bribery, personalization, perjury and fraud as the election on the referendum."

June 11, 1902—Hugh John Macdonald Prohibition Act repealed by Order-in-Council, under the provisions of the Referendum Act.

License Scandals

Beginning in 1902, there was, for the next few years, a rapid succession of liquor license scandals where licenses were granted illegally

and in defiance of the protests of the residents of the localities affected. These included scandals at Norwood, Crystal City, Elm Creek, Carman, Ethelbert, St. Rose du Lac, Napinka, Hartney, St. Boniface and Ross Street, Winnipeg.

December, 1905—Meeting of the standing committee of the Methodist Conference passes resolution censuring the conduct of the License Commissioners in granting licenses against local sentiment and in defiance of the law. Reference made to Aime Benard as a peddler of licenses, being granted licenses which no one else could get. Committee declined to wait on government, as had been arranged, declaring: "That while appreciating the action of those of its members who have made arrangements for a deputation to wait on the Provincial Government, in the opinion of this committee the conduct of the commissioners in the granting of licenses and the general lax policy of the government in administration of the license law have been such that we feel that any specific representation on our part would be futile, and we therefore content ourselves with registering an emphatic protest."

Majority, Vote in Local Option Refused

February 26, 1906—Temperance delegation, headed by C. F. Czerwinski, waited upon the government and presented a series of requests, the most important being that a majority vote should be sufficient in local option contests.

March 12, 1906—Mr. Rogers, moving a second reading of a bill to amend the Liquor License Act, refuses the request that a majority vote should be sufficient, saying that the government's position was that a three-fifth vote was necessary in cases of this kind.

March 13, 1906—A deputation of the Winnipeg Presbytery, headed by Rev. C. W. Gordon, waited upon the government to urge that in rural municipalities a majority vote should be sufficient to carry local option. Request refused by the Hon. Mr. Rogers, who received the delegation.

March 14, 1906—A clause was slipped into the Municipal Act depriving married women of the municipal franchise and giving husbands the power to vote on the property of their wives. As the result of this amendment the women electors were refused the vote in subsequent local option contests in Carman and Gladstone, the temperance forces being defeated in both places.

Methodist Conference Protests

June, 1906—at the Manitoba Methodist Conference, held in Neepawa, this resolution was passed unanimously:

"That this conference deplores the enormous development of the liquor traffic in this Province, protests against the policy of the present provincial administration in granting licenses in the interests of the traffic; approves heartily of the democratic principle of local option by the majority, and particularly with regard to the next election lays it on the conscience of its membership to scan closely the moral qualifications of parties and candidates."

January, 1907—As a result of vigorous protests and the action of the Liberal Convention in 1906 in declaring that the municipal vote should be restored to women, the Municipal Act was amended, and the clause giving the vote to women property owners restored.

Early Closing of Bars Refused

February, 1908—Large delegation, composed of Mr. Whyte (the late Sir William Whyte), J. H. Ashdown and others, presented a petition with some 9,000 signatures to it asking that the bars be closed at six o'clock. The delegation was replied to by Robert Rogers and Colin H. Campbell in the absence of the premier. Both ministers declared their opinion that the early closing of bars would be disastrous, and expressed the belief that a measure to abolish the bar-rooms altogether would be preferable.

February 16, 1908—Bill amending Liquor License Act introduced in Legislature. Provided for majority vote. Bartenders to be licensed. Local option provisions made more restrictive.

February 17, 1908—Mr. Rogers in Legislature blames drunkenness in Winnipeg upon 300 or 400 "blind pigs," and charges that the responsibility for this rests upon "certain clergymen who a few years ago succeeded in breaking up the segregated area for women in the western part of the city." Says that to close the bars at six o'clock, as asked by petition signed by 9,000 parties, would be to multiply these evils.

February 19, 1908—Delegation representing temperance organization waits on Law Amendments Committee. Government asked to limit vote to residents and to enlarge local option unit. Dr. Patrick asked that the bar be removed. Premier Roblin declared the new local option provisions "the most progressive and the most thorough ever submitted to a legislature."

Local Option Improvements Refused

February 25, 1908—Dr. Thornton, on behalf of the Liberals, moved in Legislature that the vote in local option contests be limited to resident electors. This was defeated: Yeas, 10; nays, 23.

February 25, 1908—Dr. Thornton, on behalf of the Liberals, moved that the municipalities by a resident majority vote be given the power to reduce the number of licenses. Negatived: Yeas, 9; nays, 23.

April 25, 1908—Free Press, in an article on the new Liquor Act, says: "It is known that the hotel men, whose activities were the chief factor in the success of the Roblin Government at the polls last year, have been told on behalf of the government that the new measure in the long run is intended to operate in their behalf."

Technicalities Block the Way

December 15, 1908—Local option contests in forty-five municipalities stopped by a judicial finding that the preliminaries as fixed by the amended provisions of the law had not been complied with. "Liquordom," wrote H. S. Magee in the Pioneer, "rejoiced and the temperance people were chagrined."

December, 1908—Local option by-law repealed in Kildonan municipality by the imported non-resident vote.

A writer in the Christian Guardian said: "By a sub-section of the Manitoba Liquor License Act relating to municipalities, it is possible for units of that size to have local prohibition. But this by-law is rendered almost useless on account of objections that can be taken to it on technicalities. A municipality votes when twenty-five per cent of the electors petition for it. The first year (1908) that the Moral Reform Council undertook to push local option, seventy municipalities prepared for it and forty were prevented from voting because of injunctions based on technicalities."

March 9, 1909—Dr. Thornton moved in Legislature that voting in local option contests be limited to resident voters. Negatived: Yea, 11; nays, 21.

Asked to Abolish the Bar

February 20, 1910—Delegation of temperance people, 1,600 strong, wait on government. Dr. Patrick said they were there to ask for the abolition of the bar. They were prepared to leave the matter with the people for discussion. He announced that petitions in favor of banishing the bar were being largely signed. W. W. Buchanan asked for the resident vote only in local option; for amendments to the local option law making them more workable, and for the abolition of the bar. Premier Roblin promised to consider the requests carefully, and declared that the government was prepared to go as far as the people would go with them.

Liquor Deputation Favorably Received

February 21, 1910—Delegations, comprising three hundred people, waited on the government to oppose abolition of the bar and to ask for amendments to the local option law. Speakers: T. W. Taylor, G. F. Bryan, R. M. Dennistoun and H. R. Hooper. Presented a petition in support of their request with 26,000 signatures. Request made for a three-fifth vote on local option. Mr. Roblin promised consideration. He said the petition presented by Mr. Bryan was "possibly the most important and influential that had ever been presented to the government. He did not know that he had ever received one which bore on its face such significance."

Political Administration of Licenses Denounced

June 17, 1910—T. M. Daly, police magistrate of Winnipeg, addressing the Anglican Synod, said that the law governing the sale of liquor was violated every hour in this city. Administration of liquor licenses should, he said, be taken out of political hands and invested in a commission.

October 28, 1910—Pembina and Oakland local option by-laws quashed on technicality.

February 22, 1910—A resolution limiting voting in local option contests to resident voters moved in the Legislature by Dr. Thornton, negatived by party vote.

May, 1910—Local option by-laws in Shant Lake, South Cypress, Carman and Dally quashed.

Referendum on Banish the Bar Asked for

February 16, 1911—Deputation representing the Social and Moral Reform Council ask government to submit the proposition to banish the bar to a referendum in keeping with petition to the Legislature signed by 20,000 electors. Speakers: Rev. Dr. Patrick, Rev. Dr. Crumley, W. H. Greenway and W. W. Buchanan. Amendments to the local option provisions to discourage technical objections also asked for. Mr. Roblin tells the delegation he believes they are on right lines and promises consideration. Denies that there is any serious trouble in securing the adoption of local option by-laws. “Where there has been a vote,” said Mr. Roblin, “I think in nearly every case the law stands and the bar is closed.”

June, 1911—The Manitoba Methodist Conference adopts a report deplored that while “the authorities seem anxious to please the temperance people, daily occurrences indicate that all the time they play into the hands of the liquor traffic.” Report signed, among others, by E. L. Taylor.

Breach of Faith with Carman

In August, 1911, liquor licenses were granted in Carman in repudiation of pledges given by Mr. Roblin.

In December, 1909, a local option by-law had been carried in Carman by a majority of seventy-four; but this had subsequently been quashed on a technicality.

During the election campaign of 1910, Mr. Roblin, as candidate in Dufferin, gave a pledge at a public meeting, held in Carman on July 8, that “no license will be granted in Carman until the electors by their votes decide in favor of license.”

In December, 1910, local option by-law was again carried in Carman by a majority, but was again voided on a technicality.

September, 1911—District meeting of Methodist Church for Carman and neighborhood passes strong resolution censuring the granting of a liquor license in Carman, “thus violating the public promises made by the Hon. R. P. Roblin and the assurances given to the people of Carman by the Hon. Robert Rogers. We cannot condemn too strongly such actions on the part of our public men, as we believe they are morally harmful to the young people of our country and tend to undermine and destroy the best traditions and institutions of our land.”

December, 1911—Local option committee of Carman issues statement reviewing history of the Carman liquor license case and pointing out the breach of promises by Mr. Roblin and Mr. Rogers involved in the granting of the license.

Government Refuses Referendum

February, 1912—Delegation from the Social and Moral Reform Council wait on the government to ask that the government grant the petition presented the previous year for a referendum on the proposition to banish the bar and for changes in local option provisions, W. W.

Buchanan, the first speaker, said: "They ask only that the government submit the question of banishing the bar to the electorate." Other speakers: A. E. Smith, O. B. Brethour and Rev. Dr. Crumley. Deputation replied to by C. H. Campbell, who refused to enlarge local option unit, add saving clause, or consider proposition of referendum. As a lawyer he thought there was no real difficulty in bringing local option laws into operation.

March 1, 1912—Resolution moved in Legislature by G. H. Malcolm, declaring for referendum upon the question of banish the bar, defeated 20 to 14.

March 25, 1912—Rev. Dr. Chown, in an address to the Winnipeg Ministerial Association, said he thought the government wanted it understood that they did not want the temperance vote so that the temperance people did not feel under any obligations to them.

Promise About "Saving Clause" Not Kept

April 1, 1912—Deputation from the Moral and Social Reform Council wait upon Law Amendments Committee to ask for amendments improving the local option clause. Minister of Public Works agrees to accept the "saving clause" drafted by the reform council's committee.

This pledge was not kept. At the next meeting of the committee this saving clause was deleted and the original one drafted by the government substituted. This clause subsequently proved worthless.

Premier Rejects Temperance Requests

February 13, 1913—Temperance delegation, representative of recently-held convention, waits on government. Speakers: J. Argue, G. H. McLeod, Rev. J. L. Gordon, A. Lyons and W. W. Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan asked for such amendments to local option as would make it operative, limitation of the vote to resident electors and the banishing of the bar. "The premier," said Mr. Buchanan, "was not asked to take the onus but to give a referendum and show what the majority of the people wanted." Request rejected by Sir Rodmond Roblin, who advanced the view that a vote on "banish the bar" could not be taken without endangering local option in the municipalities in which it is now in force.

A Defective "Saving Clause"

May 1, 1913—North Cypress local option by-law quashed. In rendering judgment, Chief Justice Mathers said: "It is a very serious thing that the electors having gone through the stress of a contest of the kind that these contests are, and the statutory majority has been polled in favor of the by-law, some trifling irregularity on the part of some person, entirely innocent, and which in all probability has not had the slightest effect on the result, should be held to undo what has been done."

June 4, 1913—The annual meeting of the Methodist Church of the Portage district passes resolution denouncing the saving clause added by the government at preceding session as inadequate and declaring "that until some effective remedy for this state of affairs is provided the Methodist Church declares itself opposed to the wasting of money on local option campaigns."

A License Outrage

July, 1913—Northwest Review tells story of liquor scandal at St. Anne. In the previous November the hotel license had been cancelled because liquor had been sold on Sunday to two young girls. The hotel became the property of an influential party worker and an application for a new license made. This was resisted by Father Jubinville, but in June the new license was issued. Northwest Review comments: "The way license commissioners are appointed in this province is disgraceful. Their main qualification — which should be a sufficient guarantee of their undesirability—is that they prove themselves docile party followers."

Toll Taking in License Department

August 9, 1913—At meeting of License Commission in Winnipeg, Lawyer Max Steinkopf said he had been told that the liquor license department was a medium for traffic in liquor licenses. He said he knew cases where people paid \$500 to get a license, and offered to give particulars to the commissioners in private.

Party Control of Liquor Traffic

September 19, 1913—President George Wright, of the Dominion Hotelkeepers' Association, speaking in Winnipeg at the Hotelkeepers' Convention, said that the affiliations of liquor men with the various provincial governments was a curse. "The government methods," said Mr. Wright, "have driven the trade into the hands of the party in power, and it will always be that way until an agreement is arrived at by both parties to take the whole question out of politics."

November 2, 1913—Bishop Beliveau declares that St. Boniface is "too drunk by half." The number of bars in the city was far too large, he said.

Roblin Opposed to Abolition of Bar

January 7, 1914—Deputation representing the Social Service Council waits upon the government. Speakers: Rev. G. F. McCullagh, A. W. Puttee and W. W. Buchanan. Government asked to amend the local option law to safeguard local option by-laws from being set aside on technicalities and for a referendum on the question of abolishing the bar. The premier, in his reply, says that required amendment to the local option law is not necessary and declares his opposition to proposal to banish the bar. Announces himself in favor of local option "until such time as we can have absolute prohibition."

January 13, 1914—J. B. Baird moves in legislature for a referendum on the question of abolishing the sale of intoxicating liquor in bar-rooms. Debate adjourned by Premier Roblin.

January 15, 1914—Sir Rodmond Roblin opposes proposal to have a referendum on "banish the bar," and moves an amendment that the Legislature "declines until proof is given that some other method would be more effective to endorse any action or policy regarding the liquor trade that may impair the securing of total prohibition as provided in said local option clauses." In his speech, Sir Rodmond insists that an adverse vote on a referendum to banish the bar would destroy local option by-laws in all municipalities where they are now in force.

Premier promises to provide saving clause for the local option provision of the Liquor License Act. Amendment adopted on a straight party vote: Yeas, 23; nays, 12.

Refusal to Investigate Clubs

January 31, 1914—Public Accounts Committee orders an investigation into the conduct of Winnipeg clubs and summons the managers of eight Winnipeg clubs to attend with records.

February 3, 1914—Public Accounts Committee, on motion of Hon. George R. Coldwell, supported by E. L. Taylor, K.C., reverses decision to investigate clubs. Resolution by Mr. Coldwell excusing the club managers from further attendance on the committee carried by a straight party vote of 11 to 7.

February 5, 1914—Motion by William Ferguson in Legislature, urging drastic changes in the administration and government of clubs, voted down 12 to 26, on motion by the attorney-general.

February 6, 1914—Delegation of the Social Service Council waits upon the government. Government asked to issue a Royal Commission to investigate Winnipeg clubs, to stop the multiplication of licenses and to make the early closing by-laws apply to bars. Sir Rodmond Roblin declines the request, but suggests that it might be advisable to give municipalities the power to decide how many licenses should be issued within their limits. Dr. G. B. Wilson denounces the premier's course. "You have," he said to Sir Rodmond, "nothing to offer the temperance forces and they have nothing to ask from you."

February 7, 1914—Bill providing for saving clause for Local Option Act introduced by E. L. Taylor, receives second reading.

February 10, 1914—S. Hart Green, M.P.P., makes charges against drinking clubs in Winnipeg, and demands an inquiry. Sir Rodmond Roblin refuses to grant the inquiry, and Mr. Green's resolution is defeated 26 to 11. (For further particulars of the government's refusal to investigate clubs, see detailed account, page 42.)

A Qualified Promise

February 18, 1914—Sir Rodmond Roblin writes W. W. Buchanan that "public opinion is almost or quite educated to support legislation that will give to each municipality the right to decide as to the number of licenses for the sale of liquor within its boundaries, either wholesale or retail." The premier expresses his regret "that the temperance organizations of the Province did not give me that support which I felt was necessary to justify me in passing such legislation at this session."

Tested and Found Wanting

February 19, 1914—T. C. Norris moves in Legislature that the Liquor License Act be amended, limiting the voting in local option contests to resident electors, giving the electors of a municipality power to reduce or limit the number of licenses or to prohibit the retail sale of liquor. Sir Rodmond Roblin opposes the proposition. Premier lauds Winnipeg clubs, giving special approval to the Moose Club. Norris' motion defeated on straight party vote.

LIBERAL RECORD

In 1888, when the Greenway government came into power the liquor licenses in Manitoba numbered 216. Twelve years later, when the government went out of power, they numbered only 167.

The Greenway government added the local option provisions to the Liquor License Act under which municipalities have the power to prohibit the sale of liquor.

In the general elections of 1903 the Liberal Party accepted as its candidates fifteen men recommended by the temperance organizations in their respective constituencies.

The Liberals in convention in March, 1906, adopted the following as its policy on temperance:

"That the Liberal Party place on record its cordial sympathy with the temperance movement as a moral reform, and

"Pledges itself, if returned to power, rigidly to enforce the provisions of the law with regard to the liquor traffic, and so to amend the present License Act as to make the following provisions effective:

"The enactment or repeal of local option by-laws upon the majority of the votes cast by the resident electors of cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities.

"The restoration of the municipal franchise to married women who have the necessary property qualifications.

"The appointment of License Commissioners and Inspectors who are in hearty sympathy with the enforcement of all provisions of the law.

"That licenses shall be issued once a year, and once a year only, upon application filed on or before a fixed time.

"On a petition of twenty-five per cent of the resident electors, local option must be submitted to municipal council."

The Liberal opposition in the Legislature between 1907 and 1910 advocated the reforms set forth in this platform. (For particulars see record on pages 30 and 31.)

In April, 1910, the Liberal party in convention adopted the following resolution dealing with temperance:

"That this Convention re-affirms the cordial sympathy of the Liberal Party with the temperance movement as a moral reform and pledges itself, if the Liberals are returned to power, to further amend the Liquor Act so as to

"(1) Make a majority vote of the 'resident' electors sufficient to carry a local option by-law.

"(2) Give the electors of any municipality power to limit or reduce the number of licenses to be granted by the same system as a local option by-law is voted upon.

"(3) Establish a licensing branch of the county court judges to consider all applications and grant all licenses instead of the present system of license commissioners."

At the same Convention the Liberals pledged themselves to adopt the principle of direct legislation, thus enabling the temperance party to submit any legislation they desired direct to the people.

Again the Liberal opposition in the Legislature between 1910 and 1914 urged upon the Legislature the temperance reforms set forth in their platform. (See record on pages 31 to 35.)

In 1912, the Liberals supported in the Legislature a demand that a referendum be taken on the question of "banish the bar." This was defeated by the government majority. The demand was repeated in the session of 1914 and was again defeated.

In the session of 1914 the Liberal opposition in the Legislature made a determined attempt to have an investigation into the drinking clubs of Winnipeg with a view to their abolition. (For fuller details see pages 41, 42 and 43.)

On February 19, 1914, Mr. Norris, leader of the Liberal Party, moved a series of amendments to the Liquor License Act, giving the resident majority in each municipality the power to limit, reduce or abolish the sale of liquor within the bounds of the municipality. These amendments were rejected by the government majority upon the demand of Sir Rodmond Roblin. In support of these amendments, Mr. Norris said on that occasion:

"The third reading of this measure affords an opportunity to state briefly the policy of the Liberal Party on some of the matters dealt with by this bill.

"First: We believe that the license law, itself defective in certain respects, is inefficiently enforced by the present system of district license commissions, with an inspecting staff having close relations with the organization of a political party. A single commission for the whole province, made up of county court judges, as proposed by the Liberals at the last election, or of citizens of high standing in the community, responsible to the Legislature, would at once remove the business of keeping hotels from politics, and stop the constant interference by political workers, of which such strong complaint was made by the president of the Dominion Hotelkeepers' Association at the meeting in Winnipeg some months ago. One undesirable result of the law as administered has been the multiplication in Winnipeg of places which are not really hotels, but are virtually saloons in disguise. The test of an hotel is, whether it is devoted primarily to the business of serving the travelling public, or to selling liquor. If the latter, it is not a hotel but a saloon, and it has no right to exist. The hotel, so-called, which relies upon the sale of liquor for its profits, paying little or no attention to the accommodation of the travelling public, is a menace to the community, and it should be put out of business. A very considerable proportion of the hotels of this city are of this class.

"The same distinction applies in the matter of clubs. The true social club, affording a meeting place for men, is a benefit to the business and social life of the city. Such clubs are invariably well conducted. Membership in them is an honor, which is jealously guarded. But there are clubs of another class, which are not clubs at all, in the true sense of the term. They could be more properly characterized as drinking resorts, operated for the pecuniary advantage of the proprietors. Clubs of this class can be easily located. They must be

known to the license department. They should be put out of business, and their charters cancelled.

"The Liberal Party has had for many years a well-defined policy with regard to the powers which the municipalities should exercise over liquor licenses within their boundaries. They have moved repeatedly in this House that the voting of local option by-laws should be limited to resident electors; and they have also urged that the electors of a municipality be given power by vote to limit or reduce the number of licenses. By this addition to the local option provisions of the Liquor License Law, each municipality would have the power either to declare for local prohibition, or for a limitation of the facilities for securing liquor. A further choice might profitably be given the electors of forbidding the retail sale of liquor while permitting it to be dispensed by wholesale agencies.

"I therefore move that the bill be re-committed to a committee of the whole, with instructions to add provisions which shall (1) limit the voting in local option contests to resident electors; (2) give electors of a municipality power by a majority vote to limit or reduce the number of licenses issued in the municipality; (3) give electors the further power by a majority vote to prohibit the retail sale of liquor."

ROBLIN AND COLDWELL APPLAUD TREATING HABIT

In the Legislature on March 1, 1912, Sir Rodmond Roblin and Hon. Geo. R. Coldwell, Minister of Education, speaking against the resolution moved by G. H. Malcolm, Liberal M.P.P. for Birtle, favoring a referendum on "banish the bar," upheld and lauded the treating habit.

Sir Rodmond said, as reported in the Free Press:

"The petition aimed at the treating system. This system was a manifestation of the social side of man. It was an evidence of neighbourliness and a method of showing good will. The social side of man's nature was the thing which distinguished him from the brutes. The bar, as it was at present constituted, was the outcome of ages of experiment. It was hedged about by a law and guarded in every way. What was now proposed was to tear down all these safeguards. There was no guarantee that under the new system which it was proposed to introduce conditions would be nearly as good as they are now. Under the present arrangement liquors are consumed on the premises where they are bought."

The Premier's remarks were thus reported by the Telegram:

"Now the petitions referred to in this resolution read as follows: 'That drunkenness and the pernicious treating system are promoted by the public drinking places, the licensed bar-room.'

"Now that is a statement of fact, and whether it be true or not I shall not stop to argue at this point, because it is not necessary, but manifestly one of the things that the petitioners hope to accomplish by their prayer being granted is the abolition of the treating custom."

"Now, what is the treating custom? The treating custom is simply the manifestation of the social and the intellectual qualities of man as contrary distinguished from the ordinary brute creation. If you take away the social qualities or the social and the neighborly or the hospitable side of a man you have something very little better than a brute. Here is a declared intention to curb, restrain, destroy, if possible, that social side of life. To me in the first place I think it is absolutely wrong to make any such attempt. Secondly, I know it is absolutely impossible without exterminating the race, and therefore I refuse to acknowledge the desirability of any such action."

Hon. Geo. R. Coldwell, Minister of Education, also took part in the debate. His references to the treating custom was thus reported by the Free Press:

"Hon. G. R. Coldwell, Minister of Education, contended that the only kind of sumptuary law which could be successful was that which was temperate and moderate and met with popular approval. In communities where the people wanted liquor and where the law permitted them to have it, it was better that they should be able to buy it in small quantities and for consumption on the premises. The bar was a means of regulating the sale of liquor and it should not be destroyed unless something equally good were provided to take its place. It was not reasonable to put a proposition to the people which only cut one way.

"The bar, declared Mr. Coldwell, was not the cause of the treating habit. The contrary was the case. The same habit was indulged in by the people on all occasions. It was a question of ordinary hospitality. 'The treating habit,' said the minister, 'is the principle of ordinary human hospitality imbued in our breasts.' They should not seek to take away from a man one of his best impulses.

"Mr. Johnson: 'Then you think giving a man a drink is a kindness?'

"Mr. Coldwell: 'Yes, I do, and I make no bones about it.'

"Continuing, Mr. Coldwell contended that treating was an instinct of human life which neither banishing the bar nor anything else would stop. He had never seen a man take a drink alone in a smoking room. He didn't believe the public was behind the request."

The Telegram's report of Mr. Coldwell's remarks was in these terms:

"Referring to the matter of treating, Mr. Coldwell said that as they all knew the banishing of the bar would not do away with that. Treating, he maintained, however, had nothing to do with the consumption of liquor; it was a matter of hospitality, behind it was the principle of ordinary hospitality that was imbued in human nature. They could not stop that by laws put on a thousand statute books. Getting below the surface they were running against the social instinct of the people and he did not believe in the principle that the bar was responsible for the treating habit. It was a habit implanted in them to be pleasant, agreeable, kind and sociable with our fellow man."

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PARTIES

Roblin Government's Stand

Roblin Government favors local option, which Province now has.

Roblin Government has refused nearly every request made by the temperance forces.

Roblin Government has the united support of the liquor interests.

Roblin Government has a record of fourteen years on the temperance question of an unsavory character. See the Free Press history of temperance in Manitoba in issue of February 18, 1914.

Roblin Government is opposed to a referendum on "banish the bar." Both Premier Roblin and Mr. Coldwell have declared their sympathy with the treating custom as fostering the social instincts of men and distinguishing them from the brute.

Roblin Government repealed the Prohibitory Liquor Act of Hon. Hugh Macdonald after a most corrupt and farcical referendum.

Roblin Government offers nothing new for the future. It simply stands for local option, which the Province already has, and which in its present shape is not applicable in any way to cities or towns.

Premier Roblin, in his letter to the Social Service Council, on February 27, made a very vague suggestion that he might give municipalities the power to limit or reduce licenses, but two days afterward he and every one of his followers voted against granting this power.

Roblin Government opposes woman suffrage.

Roblin Government opposes direct legislation.

The Liberal Position

Liberals also favor local option. A former Liberal Government placed this Act on the Statute Book.

Liberal members in the Legislature have stood and voted for these requests.

Liberals have their record yet to make.

Liberals have consistently voted for a referendum on "banish the bar."

Liberals have pledged themselves to supplement local option law by giving municipalities power to reduce any class of liquor license.

The Liberals have also pledged themselves:

To pass an act to abolish bars subject to a referendum.

To cut off a large number of liquor licenses.

To cut off all proprietary club licenses.

To prohibit sale of liquor on Christmas Day, Good Friday and Thanksgiving Day.

To shorten the hours of sale.

To limit the local option vote to resident voters.

To issue no licenses where a local option by-law is upset through technicalities.

Liberals endorse woman suffrage, which would help the temperance cause.

Liberals are pledged to direct legislation, by which the people can secure any temperance legislation they require.

THE GROWTH OF LIQUOR LICENSES

During the last fourteen years this has been the record of liquor licenses issued by the Provincial government (only hotel, wholesale and club or restaurant licenses being included):

1900	171
1901	188
1902	194
1903	226
1904	249
1905	254
1906	261
1907	269
1908	267
1909	282
1910	274
1911	284
1912	296

The official records for 1913 have not yet been published. Restaurant licenses disappeared in 1904 and club licenses made their first appearance in 1909; in 1912 there were 16 club licenses issued. Bearing in mind the gradual spread of local option territory, the showing made by these figures supports the charge that the government has encouraged, in every way possible, the establishment of drinking places. The honest enforcement of the license law would result in the speedy reduction of the licenses in force in this Province by at least twenty-five per cent.

CONDEMNATION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S LIQUOR RECORD

From a resolution adopted at a meeting of the office bearers of the Presbyterian Churches in the city of Winnipeg, held in Westminster Church, February 24, 1914:

"Since the temperance question is the most important issue before the Manitoba electorate, and since the public policy of the Premier of the Province is favorable to the liquor traffic and opposed to the interests of temperance, the temperance electors of this Province, in our opinion, are justified in the entire withdrawal of their support from Premier Roblin and from those who uphold him in his attitude on the temperance question."

At a meeting of Methodist office holders and clergymen in the city of Winnipeg, held in Grace Church, on March 13, 1914, the following resolution was adopted with but one dissenting vote:

"We declare our profound disapproval of the administration of the liquor laws of the Province by the Roblin Government, and we deplore the evident sympathy which has existed, and does exist, between the Government and the liquor traffic, which has frustrated almost completely all advances in temperance legislation and administration."

Rev. Dr. S. G. BLAND, of Wesley, at the temperance mass meeting in Zion Church, Tuesday, February 11, 1914: "I do not think that politics have been as corrupt in any province in Canada as in Manitoba in the last ten years. . . . The temperance forces of Manitoba should never make another visit to a government so utterly out of sympathy with its cause. . . ."

Rev. W. B. CASWELL, B.A., pastor of Broadway Methodist Church, at temperance mass meeting in Zion Church, February 11, 1914: "I think it is time to stop sending deputations to the Premier, asking him to banish the bar. The time has come to change this to 'banish the party' . . . "

Rev. Dr. J. L. GORDON, pastor of Central Congregational Church, Winnipeg, February 15, 1914, said: "I simply stand appalled at the possibility of five years more of rum rule. Think of it, I say, five years more of drunken men, staggering fools, gambling hells, vice dictation, broken homes, crime and shame. Five years more of apology for the bar-room! Five years more of lax interpretation of the law! Five years more of flaming billposters exciting men to drink! Five years more of the underworld! Five years more of liquid demonology! . . . Dr. Wilson charged in the presence of the Premier that the Roblin Government is in league with the liquor traffic. If Sir Rodmond does not take Dr. Wilson seriously, I am pleased to inform him that the community does."

GOVERNMENT PROTECTS DRINKING CLUBS

Public attention was drawn to the prevalence of undesirable drinking clubs in Winnipeg and their danger to the community by the evidence given to the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the escape of Krafchenko from the Winnipeg Police Station by Percy Hagel, the Winnipeg lawyer, who was afterwards found guilty of assisting in his escape, and was sentenced to three years in the penitentiary. Mr. Hagel, in giving evidence on January 16, 1914, in accounting for his movements during the preceding week, recounted a series of visits paid to drinking clubs, among the names mentioned being those of the Orchestral Musicians Club, the Moose Club and the Cosmopolitan Club. These places were visited after the hotel bars had been closed. He testified that he and his party were in the Moose Club from one to four o'clock drinking and listening to music; afterwards they took a taxicab and visited a disreputable resort.

In reply to an enquiry he said that he never had any trouble in getting access to "clubs of that class."

As a result of this evidence the License Department on the following Saturday suspended the license of the Moose Club. Mayor Deacon, of Winnipeg, gave out an interview denouncing the night clubs of Winnipeg. He said he had received many complaints regarding them, particularly the Moose Club. He had heard complaints of men who were robbed in the gambling games, and he had even had complaints from women who said that their husbands, interdicted from getting drinks from regular hotel bars, got it without trouble at the Moose and other clubs at all hours and on Sundays.

Attention was also drawn to the conditions created by the existence of these clubs by the newspapers and by various clergymen. A strong movement was started to bring about a searching investigation. On January 31 in the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature, T. H. Johnson, Liberal member for West Winnipeg, secured the passage of a resolution ordering an investigation into the conduct of eight pro-

prietary clubs, the Garry, the Moose, the Oberon Scandinavian, the Pyramid, the Cosmopolitan, the Great West and the Printers'. The motion was resisted by Mr. McMeans, M.P.P. for South Winnipeg, who declared that the Committee had no power to investigate the clubs, and by E. L. Taylor, M.P.P. A. M. Lyle, Conservative M.P.P. for Arthur, supported the Liberal members of the Committee and the resolution was carried by 7 to 5.

When the Public Accounts Committee met on February 3 to carry out the investigation there was a full attendance of Conservative members, and a motion made by the Hon. George R. Coldwell stopping the investigation and releasing the managers of the clubs from the necessity of giving evidence was carried by a vote of 11 to 7. A. M. Lyle, who had supported the Liberal motion previously, absented himself from the Committee. H. W. Whitla, K.C., who appeared for the clubs, resisted an attempt to secure the membership lists of these clubs, claiming that some of the young men who were members might get into trouble with their employers for frequenting places of this class where liquor was sold.

Following this, two resolutions were submitted to the Legislature, one by William Ferguson, Conservative M.P.P. for Hamiota, limiting the hours in which liquor could be sold in these clubs to meal times, and making a minimum joining fee of \$50.00 for each club. The other resolution, moved by T. H. Johnson, M.P.P., called for the cancellation of the licenses and the repeal of the charters of these clubs. Both these resolutions were opposed by the government and were defeated by a party vote. The government, however, amended the Act to prohibit the sale of liquor after midnight.

On February 6, a strong delegation, representing the Social Service Council, waited upon the government and made a number of requests. One of these was a request, preferred by Rev. Dr. C. W. Gordon, that a Royal Commission be appointed to investigate club life in Winnipeg. This Sir Rodmond Roblin declined to do unless specific charges of wrong doing were laid. On February 10, S. Hart Green, Liberal M.P.P. for North Winnipeg, on his responsibility as a member of the House, charged that the proprietary clubs of Winnipeg were operated in violation of the law and good morals, and demanded an investigation. Sir Rodmond Roblin refused to grant the request. He declared that he would not allow the Legislature to be used to slander and blackmail these clubs. Declaring that the statements about the clubs made by Percy Hagel in his evidence were untrue, he said that the license should be restored to the Moose Club. Mr. Green's resolution was voted down, 26 to 11.

The matter of the clubs came up again in the Legislature on February 19, when Mr. Norris moved a series of amendments to the Liquor License Act. In refusing to agree to these, Sir Rodmond Roblin made a warm defence of the proprietary clubs. He lauded these clubs as meeting places for poor men who were unable to join the exclusive social clubs. "I know," said Sir Rodmond, "ministers of the Gospel who the last three weeks have gone through the Moose Club and are willing to testify that its appointments and equipments are of the same

class as those of the Adanac Club." The Premier went on to say: "These so-called revelations about clubs, what is there at the basis of them? They all arise out of one special fact. A man who is charged with conspiracy in releasing a prisoner, in seeking to account for his actions, made use of the statement that he had entered a certain club after closing hours and had been served with intoxicating liquor. What he said may be correct. It may be quite true, and saying that for the sake of argument, is there a man in this House, even to the leader of the opposition, who is willing to say that he accepts the statements as true? There is not a decent, respectable man in this city who could or would do it upon his honor. It is only the partisan playing for base party capital or advantage who will. Men of honor will not do it. It is only the man who is willing to assassinate character and honor who will do such things."

Sir Rodmond Roblin also made loud complaint about the vigor with which Mr. Norris, who had spoken previously, had attacked these drinking resorts. "My honorable friend," said Sir Rodmond Roblin, "has exhausted his vocabulary in finding words wherewith to describe certain places, 'resorts, rummuries, druggeries, saloons and the like,' words which would have stung our old lexicographer, Johnson, to interpret. If he is moved by an honest desire to promote temperance and sobriety I do not think such intemperate language will beget him either support or sympathy."

Immediately subsequent to this speech of Sir Rodmond Roblin's, the next day, the license was restored to the Moose Club and it opened its doors once more for business.

Clubs are Proprietary

In his defence of these clubs, Sir Rodmond referred to them with a fine burst of indignation as "associations of gentlemen." The fact is that without a single exception, these cheap clubs are all proprietary, owned outright and personally managed by one or two men or by a close corporation incorporated as a joint stock company. The clubs are run solely for profit, charge regular bar prices for all liquors, and the profits all go to the owners.

With but one or two exceptions, extensive gambling operations are carried on day and night—whenever a sufficient number of players congregate. In these clubs the gambling games are run by professional gamblers in the pay of the proprietor; a stiff "rake-off" makes the club owner absolutely certain of an enormous profit on the operation apart from the practically certain winnings of the professional gamblers who get only their wages and whose winnings go to "the house."

Until the agitation against these clubs arose as a result of the publicity given them by the Hagel trial, membership in them was an absolute farce, as practically anyone, known or unknown, could gain admission at any hour and secure liquor. Warned by the license authorities, the club owners have of late come nearer to living up to the law, but membership is still little better than a farce. Sir Rodmond declared that the cost of membership amounts to "perhaps \$5 or \$10 a year." The fact is that \$1 is the usual annual membership fee charged, and in several of the clubs, while the membership ticket makes it appear that this amount is paid, the "member" really pays nothing.

The evidence of Hagel as to men he saw or met in these clubs corroborated statements made by police officials that the criminal element are regular patrons of many of these clubs.

REV. DR. WILSON'S IMPEACHMENT OF SIR RODMOND ROBLIN

Rev. Dr. George B. Wilson, of St. Augustine Church, Winnipeg, as a member of a temperance delegation which waited on Sir Rodmond Roblin on February 6, 1914, impeached the Premier's record on temperance in a powerful speech, in the course of which he said:

"Twelve or thirteen years ago we had on the statute books of Manitoba a general prohibitory law. It had been passed in fulfilment of the prohibition pledges made by your party. It was as near total prohibition as prohibition men in this Province, in view of the difficulties, would venture to draft a prohibitory law. It had been held to be good law in the highest court of the Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It fell to you, as Premier, to enforce that prohibitory law. A friend of temperance would have enforced it. You did not enforce it. You trifled with it. You juggled with it. You referendumized it. You repealed it. You robbed the people of Manitoba of prohibition. In the face of these facts, it is impossible to believe that you are a friend of temperance. It is impossible to doubt that you are a foe of temperance.

Attitude to Law Enforcement .

"II.—The second reason I allege is this—your attitude to the enforcement of such temperance measures as we have in this Province, namely, local option and the liquor license act where they are respectively in force, is unfriendly to temperance. There is a long series of failures to the credit of your License Department, and we have not forgotten cases like the Norwood license, which was forced upon the people of Norwood against the petition of ninety per cent of the people. They appealed for redress to your government, but you were unsympathetic and their appeal was vain. Indeed, sir, all the facts obtainable point to a working understanding between your government and the liquor interests of this Province.

When Clubs Grew Up

"III.—These undesirable clubs which have outraged public sentiment, become even a menace to morals, government, property and life, when did they come into being? They have sprung up, sir, grown, flourished and done their deadly work mainly under your regime. They got their licenses from your government. It was your duty to regulate them properly. An efficient government must know their general character. You do know, for you applauded the statement in this house that many of these clubs are worse than hotel bars. What are you doing with them then? They continue to exist by your permission. You did not regulate them though you had the power and it was your duty. You did not withdraw their licenses with the exception of the Moose Club. You did not punish them. You did not investigate them, and you have no real answer to give the public which, in self-defence, insists on a thorough judicial investigation.

Objects to House Committee

"Your proposition last night in this house of a legislative committee before which members might lay a charge against those clubs offers nothing and deceives nobody. Anyone can lay such a charge now in the police courts and can have the charge investigated there more fairly than before your committee, where he would have to face the

handicap of a party and partisan majority. With all your machinery of government, with all your provincial police, with all the information possessed by your license inspectors, this is the only answer you have to make to the public, and it is no real answer. Your proposal is to turn the members of this house, perhaps also the Social Service Council, into informers and detectives. This is not a worthy proposition to come from you, sir. It affronts the public intelligence. What is wanted and desired is a thorough and impartial investigation by a Royal Commission with full powers to investigate:

"(a) The undesirable clubs.

"(b) The undesirable hotels.

"(c) The whole liquor license department of your government and its continued failure vigorously to enforce temperance legislation. In this regard, let me repeat, you have no real answer.

Real Friends

"IV.—Your treatment of real friends of temperance. If any further proof is necessary of my statement that you are a foe of temperance and not a friend, the proof is found in your attitude toward the real friends of temperance. Temperance conventions have called on you for temperance reform, but they have called in vain. Churches and public bodies have passed temperance resolutions, but their resolutions have been fruitless to move you. Numerous petitions have been laid on the table of this house. They have been received with less than courtesy and given no serious consideration. Large and influential delegations have urged upon you the necessity of temperance reform but they have pled in vain. Every wave of moral enthusiasm has broken fruitlessly against the rock of your cynical and stony indifference. Even the promised curative clause, the 'saving clause,' in the License Act, sought so long, has been sought in vain and is not yet given. It is at last promised by you, but on the eve of an election where, if you win, you can repeal or negative it and if you lose the election your opponents must pay the price of your belated legislation.

Challenges Roblin

"Since these things are so, Mr. Premier, for they have not been done in a corner; since this situation is known to every thinking man in Manitoba and far beyond this province, I do not join this delegation in asking you for any progressive legislation. Such a step would be useless. There is a time when valor is the better part of discretion, when boldness is the only wisdom, when courage holds the keys of conquest. I shall not take time to paint a moving picture of the ravages of intemperance in our midst, to tell you of broken-hearted parents, of weeping wives, of shamed sisters, of drunkards' graves and gamblers' suicides. For four years this tragic panorama has passed before you and it has failed to move you, but the situation, Mr. Premier, is at last clear. Earnest men haven't any time for trifling. They have no wish to participate longer in the annual and unpleasant farce of asking you for temperance legislation. With all your strength, you are not in a position to do anything for the great cause of temperance. As surely as the Philistines bound and blinded Samson, so surely the liquor party has bound and blinded you. You have nothing to offer the friends of temperance and they have nothing to hope for at your hands."

Dr. Wilson Endorsed

On February 11, at a temperance mass meeting, held in Zion Church, Winnipeg, on February 11, 1914, the following resolution was moved by Rev. W. B. Caswell, of Broadway Methodist Church, seconded by Rev. Dr. Bland, of Wesley College:

"That this meeting of the citizens of Winnipeg expresses its approval of the following sentiments:

"That in its judgment the time has arrived to publicly express to the Premier of this Province and his government that the people have not forgotten the act of this government some years ago in not enforcing the mandate of the people by putting into force the legislation which a former administration of the same political party had just passed.

"And, inasmuch, as a referendum was forced upon the electorate marked for and afterwards, when requested by 20,000 electors, referendum was refused.

"And inasmuch as licenses in more than one instance were granted against the expressed wish of an overwhelming majority of the people locally concerned.

"And, inasmuch as the present government has failed to fully enforce the provisions of the present Liquor Act.

"And, that this meeting heartily endorse the sentiments uttered by the Rev. Dr. G. B. Wilson on the floor of the legislative chamber, last Friday, in respect to temperance matters."

DECLARATION OF MR. NORRIS ON THE TEMPERANCE ISSUE

The stand of Mr. Norris, Liberal leader, on the temperance issue, was clearly outlined at Portage la Prairie, February 10, 1914, when he was reported as follows:

With frank simplicity, T. C. Norris, the Liberal leader in Manitoba, last night told a big audience here exactly what he is prepared to do with the liquor traffic if returned to power at the next provincial elections.

He promised immediate action to banish the bar, following a majority vote of the people in favor of that policy.

There should be, he said, no delay in taking the vote beyond what was necessary for a full and ample discussion of the question. Further, no other question which might confuse the people, should be submitted at the same time as the temperance referendum. Everything should be done to secure the most accurate and complete expression of public opinion.

Mandate Alone Needed

Next, Mr. Norris pledged himself actually to abolish the bar as soon as the people should give him their mandate. It would be necessary to allow a few months for the liquor. It would be necessary to allow a few months for the liquor people to retire from business, he said. The transition would be accomplished with as little hardship as possible, but it would be accomplished, and practically without delay.

Finally, there should be no "joker" in the bill. As a pledge of their sincerity, the Liberal party would allow the temperance forces themselves to draft the measure and would undertake to make it law according to the conditions outlined.

SOCIAL SERVICE COUNCIL APPROVES LIBERAL POLICY

At a meeting of the executive of the Social Service Council of Manitoba, held April 11, 1914, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"Resolved, that the temperance resolution of the Liberal Convention, as interpreted by the leader of the party, is acceptable and satisfactory to the Social Service Council."

On the provincial executive of the Social Service Council there is a representative of every denomination in the province of temperance and religious organizations and of other bodies, such as the Trades and Labor Council and the Grain Growers. In addition, there is an advisory board made of a number of leading citizens. The president of the council is the Rev. C. W. Gordon, D.D.

BAPTIST MINISTERS ENDORSES LIBERAL STAND

The Baptist Ministers' Association of Winnipeg, in regular session on April 27, 1914, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, that in view of the present temperance situation in this province and the known record of the political party now in power in relation thereto, as well as the declared intention of the party now in opposition, if returned to power, to adopt and enforce practically the whole of the temperance policy of the Manitoba Social Service Council 'representing all the Christian churches' this fraternal association of the Baptist ministers of Winnipeg believes that the best interests of the community would be served by the hearty and unqualified support of the Liberal party by the temperance electors in the forthcoming political election in this province."

SIR RODMOND ROBLIN AND THE STANLEY BREWING CO.

In March, 1912, the Stanley Mineral Springs and Brewing Co., Ltd., with head offices in Winnipeg, made public its prospectus. This announced that the company had been formed to take over the Stanley Mineral Springs Co., Ltd., and to operate in connection with it an up-to-date brewing plant. Under the heading of "The Market," the prospectus said: "The rapid growth and development of Western Canada and the increased prosperity in all lines of business make this a most opportune time for the establishment of a new brewery. More than 45 per cent of the population of Western Canada was born out of Canada, and it is estimated that over 70 per cent of this immigrant population comes from beer drinking countries."

The list of directors included the name of D. E. Sprague, of Winnipeg, who is and has been for many years chairman of the Liquor License Commissioners for the Winnipeg district. "The directors," says the prospectus, "own and control about eighteen licenses in the city of Winnipeg, of which the company will be the beneficiary. The directors also control indirectly a large number of licenses scattered throughout the West, and this will immediately form the basis of a very large distribution of all the products of the company."

An estimate of the earnings showed that the company expected to make 50,000 barrels of beer each year at a cost of \$4 and to sell the beer at \$10 a barrel, thus making a very handsome profit after allowing for expenses of management and distribution.

A. H. Martens & Co., Ltd., 36 King Street East, Toronto, stockbrokers, issued this prospectus and sent it to possible investors, accompanying it with a letter making an offer of first mortgage 6 per

cent 20-year gold bonds of the Stanley Mineral Springs and Brewing Co. to the extent of \$350,000. This letter, after pointing out the advantages possessed by the company, goes on to say: "Apart from the personnel of the directorate, the fact that such men as Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Donald Mann, Hon. R. P. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, Hon. R. Rogers, D. E. Sprague, etc., are interested in the welfare of the company is, to those who know the records of these men, sufficient guarantee of the success of the company's undertakings."

This prospectus, with the accompanying letter, showed that this company, through its directors, secretly owned or controlled a large number of liquor licenses in Western Canada; that the company calculated to make much of its profits by the exploitation of the foreign born residents of Western Canada coming from beer drinking countries; and that among the influential parties interested in the success of the company was Sir Rodmond Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba.

Upon the publication of the contents of this prospectus in the summer of 1912, Sir Rodmond Roblin and Mr. Rogers gave out newspaper interviews making a general denial of the statement contained in the prospectus and the letter, but there is no record that Martens & Co. deemed it necessary to withdraw the statements made by them to the investing public in the letter from which the above extracts are quoted.

Woman Suffrage

At the convention of March, 1914, the Liberal Party declared in favor of woman suffrage by this resolution:

"The Liberal Party, believing that there are no just grounds for debarring women from the right to vote, will enact a measure providing for equal suffrage, upon it being established by petition that this is desired by adult women to a number equivalent to fifteen per cent of the vote cast at preceding general election in this Province."

The provision for a petition, preliminary to legislation, is one which will be easily met if, as is believed, there is a desire on the part of the women of Manitoba to possess and exercise the franchise. In the judgment of prominent members of the Political Equality League—the organization which has for some years been advocating equal suffrage for Manitoba — the provision of the petition was desirable, as tending to familiarize the women of the Province with their new responsibilities.

The resolution was adopted with unanimity and enthusiasm by the convention, and embodies the convictions and intentions of the Liberal Party. In submitting the resolution to the convention, W. H. Trueman presented the case for it.

"There are two many blots and running sores in the public life of to-day," Mr. Trueman said, "to permit us to say that we have a perfect state. There are the ills of poverty, excessive taxation, the claim that taxes should be assessed against the owner and not against the consumer. There are also the ills of war. A perfect social justice must rectify this state of affairs. It will be possible to do so, we hope, if we introduce women into the public life of the country.

"There is a broader reason for our adopting this resolution. It will be a power to advance the common cause of all humanity. It is one of the substantial arguments for woman suffrage that if you equip women with the franchise you will enable them to take a more active part in our elections. That fireside argument has been pounded to powder. For many years now thousands of women have been earning their own living.

"The Liberals wanted women to be on an equality and to enjoy increased responsibility. By that means they would make a distinctly better humanity in improving her condition. To widen the franchise had been a struggle of centuries against the opposition of kings and aristocracies. That had always been the work of the Liberal Party. It had ever struggled to widen the freedom of men and was always in the forefront of all the struggles that bring about a better order of justice. That work is not yet finished, nor will be as long as this injustice is uncorrected. The enfranchisement of women would put a consummation to the noble work of the party."

The "Mess of Politics"

In August, 1912, when cable advices from England told of a movement to send a band of militant suffragettes to Canada for a campaign

in the Dominion, Sir Rodmond Roblin gave an interview for publication in which he said:

"I am utterly opposed to the campaign for votes for women.

I feel that politics is no sphere in which woman should exercise herself. At the same time I have never found the women of Canada expressing any particular desire for the vote, and, as a matter of fact, I think they think more of themselves. For myself I think too highly of my mother, my wife and my sisters to wish to see women mixed up in the mess of politics."

REJECTED BY ROBLIN

On January 27, 1914, the Political Equality League of Manitoba waited on Premier Roblin with one of the largest delegations that has ever filled the legislative chamber, and demanded the vote for women. The speakers were Mrs. Nelli McClung, Dr. Mary Crawford, Ald. R. A. Rigg, Roderick McKenzie, Mrs. E. Kelly and Rev. R. Marteinsson. The premier was unequivocal in his answer that he was opposed to woman suffrage, that he considered it a retrograde step, and that if women got the vote it would mean the ruin of the home and throwing of the children to the servants.

Following are some extracts from Sir Rodmond's remarkable speech on that occasion:

Declaring that the franchise would work against the home, he said: "For every marriage in the United States there is a divorce. Now you say that divorce as it exists in the United States at present makes for a good home. (Cries of 'No, no.') I say, why, then, is there divorce in the United States? It is because woman has left that sphere which, as wife and mother, she occupied for fifty or a hundred years." ("No, no.")

"I have doubt about the value of woman suffrage and I am not going to push you into a condition that is worse than the present condition.

"Look at the United States where you have woman suffrage. In Chicago there are woman's clubs scattered everywhere, showing how woman has deserted the home. They have bridge parties, five o'clock teas and tango dances, but have they anything that contributes to the upbuilding of a strong, moral character in the nation?

"Yet even in the states where they have woman suffrage, they are not using the privilege. In Colorado they shrink from from the polls as from a pestilence. (Cries of 'Oh, oh.')

"I believe woman suffrage would break up the homes and send women to mix up in political meetings. I do not admit, however, that politics is necessarily corrupt. I do not know how that idea got abroad. I have been in politics for many years and do not know of anything corrupt."

To the ripple of incredulous laughter at this remark, Sir Rodmond continued:

"I judge from your laughter that you have knowledge of corruption. I have had some thirty years' experience in politics and I have not. If you know that politics is corrupt why do you want to interfere with it?"

"As I say I have been in politics thirty years and more and I do not know anything about corrupt politics. I have never seen or even heard of any member of this legislature having a suggestion made to him that was corrupt or improper. And, consequently, when you say that things are corrupt, it is only the imaginations of a wicked and vile mind.

"I believe woman suffrage would be a retrograde movement, that it will break up the home, that it will throw the children into the arms of the servant girls. Indeed, I am afraid my friend Mr. Rikg might shortly come to us with a request of the franchise to servant girls, on the plea that servant girls have as good a right to vote as any other class of women.

"Probably I was born too soon, but I cannot accept the avalanche of argument that has been presented to day."

In the legislature on February 3, 1914, a resolution offered by G. H. J. Malcolm, Birtle, "that in the opinion of this house such amendments should be made to the Manitoba Election Act as would enable women to vote at elections for members of the legislative assembly," was voted down by the straight government majority at the express command of Sir Rodmond Roblin, who declared that he looked upon it as a "want of confidence" vote. Harvey Simpson, Virden, who at the previous session had moved a similar resolution absented himself from his seat when the resolution was introduced, although he had been in the chamber when the speaker entered. The vote was 23 to 12, the Liberal opposition voting solidly for the resolution to which several Liberal members spoke.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN THE ANTIPODES

Women have already been admitted to the parliamentary franchise in many of the world's most progressive communities.

The Commonwealth of Australia, when it came into being in 1901, at once conferred the suffrage on women, the qualifications being the same for men and women. Women also have the vote for state purposes in all the states of the Australian Commonwealth.

In New Zealand women have shared the parliamentary franchise with men since 1893. In the first general election in which they took part, in 1895, eighty-five per cent of the women on the lists voted.

In both Australia and New Zealand the enlargement of the electorate by the inclusion of women has worked satisfactorily. The percentage of women who vote is but a shade less than one per cent of voters among the males.

IN EUROPE

In Finland there has been equal suffrage since 1906, both men and women acquiring the franchise at the age of twenty-four. There are 14 women members in the Finnish Parliament numbering 200 members.

In Norway women were given a partial franchise, limited by property qualification in 1909. In 1913 a constitutional amendment gave women the suffrage on the same terms as men.

In Denmark the law first passed in 1912 by the Folkething, the popular house, providing for universal suffrage, without distinction of

sex, for all over thirty years of age, will become effective in 1914, after having been held up for two years by the opposition of the Upper House or Landsting.

IN THE UNITED STATES

Woman suffrage has had its fullest test in the United States. There are now ten states and one territory in which women vote in state, congressional and presidential contests. These states, with the year in which they gave the vote to women are:

Wyoming	1869
Colorado	1893
Utah	1896
Idaho	1896
Washington	1910
California	1911
Oregon	1912
Kansas	1912
Arizona	1912
Illinois	1913
Alaska (Territory)	1913

The movement, it will be noted, is speeding up in the United States. Seven of these states have come into the equal suffrage column since 1910. It is expected that the number of equal suffrage states will double during the next four or five years. Montana, Nevada and the two Dakotas will vote on the proposition in 1914, and in 1915 a constitutional amendment giving women the vote will be submitted to the electors of New York and of New Jersey. The law-making bodies of Wisconsin and Pennsylvania are on record with favorable but not final action.

In 1913 a study of legislation in the equal suffrage states, for which the women were chiefly responsible, was made by two members of the New York bar and the results published by the National Suffrage Association. This legislation, in all the states, has much in common.

In California, since the enfranchisement of the women three years ago, laws have been passed fixing conditions under which children may be employed, providing for juvenile courts and state supervision and education of delinquent children, providing training schools for dependent orphans, establishing free kindergartens, appointing an industrial welfare commission to fix conditions of labor for women, for pension fund for public school teachers, equal guardianship for minors, against white slavery and prostitution, providing for cold storage.

Every one of the equal suffrage states has a complete compulsory education law safeguarded and bulwarked by truant schools and truant officers, parental delinquency provisions, etc.

Colorado, Arizona and Oregon are the three great experiment stations for penitentiary reforms, and have demonstrated the absolute practicability of the "honor-and-trust" plan. Californian women in 1913 secured a provision for the payment of wages to working convicts and for assistance to discharged prisoners.

In Idaho at the last election 76 per cent of the women registered voted and about 84 per cent of the men. In Wyoming and Utah, it is stated, in an article in the *Century* (March, 1914) that women vote in the same proportion as men.

In Wyoming there are three women in the Legislature; in Colorado two in the lower house and one in the Senate; in Utah three; in Washington two.

IN GREAT BRITAIN

In Great Britain woman suffrage is supported by many public men of eminence—among them Lloyd-George, Augustine Birrell, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Haldane, Lord Morley, Arthur J. Balfour, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Hugh Cecil and Bonar Law. Bills giving parliamentary franchise to women already exercising the municipal franchise received their second reading by large majorities in the British Parliament in 1910 and 1911, in the latter year by a vote of 207 to 90. These bills failed to pass the House because facilities for further consideration were not provided. In 1912 this bill failed on its second reading by a vote of 228 to 208 owing largely to irritation due to outrages by the militants. The Dickenson Bill, giving the franchise to a much larger number of women, secured, on the motion for its second reading, on May 6, 1913, the votes of 219 members, comprising 22 Unionists, 151 Liberals, 12 Nationalists and 34 Labor members. The adverse vote numbering 266 was made up of 133 Unionists, 78 Liberals and 55 Nationalists. This shows that the British Liberals are, by a large majority, favorable to equal suffrage despite the opposition of Mr. Asquith.

SIR EDWARD GREY'S ARGUMENT

In the debate in the British House of Commons on May 6, 1913, Sir Edward Grey, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the British Government, made a strong argument in favor of suffrage for women, in the course of which he said:

"There is one argument I must deal with though I think there is very little in it, but it is so frequently used, and that is that women cannot employ force, that they cannot bear arms and fight, and that they cannot enforce the law, and therefore ought to have no share in making the laws. Hardly any of us do enforce the laws, and I understand if we tried to do so ourselves we would probably get into great trouble. We employ selected persons who are paid and directed to enforce the laws by force when they need to be enforced. Surely the true qualification of people to have a share in the making of the laws, assuming that they are responsible people, is not whether they are to be called upon physically to enforce the laws, but whether they have got to obey the laws. As to the enforcement of the law, the municipal authorities have, to a very great extent, the direction of the police. Surely with them rests the initiative in deciding whether the military should be called on in particular cases, and yet women have votes for those bodies and can even sit on them.

"As to fighting, it is said women cannot become soldiers, and that in an emergency they cannot fight and risk their lives in fighting for their country. It is urged that they are not to have votes as they will not have to be shot at themselves, and, as far as I understand the argument, they must not vote on a policy which may lead to men being shot. I do not think anybody really believes that if women had the vote they are going to embark on a policy which would lead recklessly to war. Surely the most pathetic thing in war is the suffering and grief which is brought to the women in the homes, even more

than the suffering of men in the field. Does anybody say, for instance, taking an analogy from industry, that because women are not suited to go down the pit and hew the coal they ought not to have votes on industrial questions at all?

"I maintain more and more it should be recognized, and I think more and more it is recognized, that the character of the home, the condition of the home, the standard of the home, the nurture and rearing of the children is as essential a thing in the state as anything else. That is women's business, the business which cannot be done by any one else, and that that should be done, and well done, is at least as essential for the life of the state as the condition or use of armed forces. One is complementary to the other.

"Does anybody really believe that that is going to lead to a contest of men versus women? Of course not. Women will be divided on general political questions just as men are, but I think enfranchisement will do a great deal to level the attention of both to the questions which most deeply concern them. Can you be sure that those questions are not jostled and hustled and crowded out now?

"I do not believe for a moment that the extension of the vote is going, as some people suppose, to degrade women or impair the relations between women and men. That chivalry of the physically strong towards the physically weak is far too deeply rooted in human nature to be affected by any political change. The allegation that women are going to lose some superiority by having votes does not correspond with the facts of life. Women are not invited by both sides to take part in much that is dusty and exciting at contested elections. The exercise of the vote is the most quiet and unobtrusive and unobjectionable form of political activity. You may argue as you like about women having a special position which is going to be impaired, but I do not believe anybody supposes that in practice, either now or in the future, to be deprived of a vote is going to be a badge of superiority.

"The whole tendency of modern life and education is towards the suffrage for women. Generations ago, the things which we associated with political life and work were assumed to be outside the sphere not merely of women's work, but of women's thought. All that has been changed. Everything is being done to encourage the intellectual interests of women in literature, science, history, poetry and politics. It is simply done to make women more companionable, or is it to give them a real independent interest of their own in the realm of human thought, to give them interests which will make their outlook wider and to equip them to play a part in national life? You cannot encourage all this and maintain a sex barrier against the vote. Labor, wages, housing, land, temperance, taxation, education and every question that deals with the efficiency and the standard of home life and human life—as long as women have not the vote your democracy on all these questions will be hopelessly incomplete. The stake in the country of women in its welfare, prosperity, happiness and success is at least as great as that of man. If mistakes are made, if national misfortunes come, the suffering which is entailed by poverty and distress comes home as much to women as to men."

Direct Legislation

At the Liberal convention of March, 1914, the party reaffirmed its endorsement of the principle of Direct Legislation in the following terms:

That this convention endorses the principle of Direct Legislation by means of the Initiative and Referendum and maintains that the adoption of this reform as a part of our system of Government would give effect to the will of the people and would therefore be entirely in harmony with true democracy and British constitutional government.

Direct Legislation was adopted as a plank in the Liberal platform at the convention of 1910 and in each succeeding year it has been brought before the legislature. In 1911, following the hearing of a deputation from the Direct Legislation League, C. D. McPherson, Lakeside, offered a resolution adopting the principle, but this was voted down at the direction of Premier Roblin who had informed the deputation that they should proceed with their propaganda of education as he did not believe that the people knew enough about Direct Legislation to know whether they wanted it or not.

In 1912 a similar resolution was offered, but it was sidetracked from the order paper and was never brought before the house.

On January 21, 1913, C. D. McPherson, Lakeside, moved the following resolution, seconded by T. C. Norris:

"That in the opinion of this house the legislative power should be vested in the crown and legislative assembly, elected by the people, but the people to reserve to themselves power to propose laws and enact or reject the same at the polls, and also reserve power at their own option to approve or reject at the polls any act of the legislative assembly. The first power reserved by the people is the initiative and it may be ordered by a petition of the electorate. The second power reserved by the people is the referendum, and it may be ordered (except as to laws necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety) either by the legislative assembly or by a petition of the electorate."

Condemned by Roblin

Sir Rodmond Roblin deferred his reply to this resolution until January 27, when he condemned the principle of Direct Legislation from every angle. He declared it to be "inapplicable, unwarranted, socialistic and un-British". "It would," he said, "destroy the symmetry and beauty of responsible government which the British people had reached after 700 years. It was a mark of decadent republicanism." He announced that he was absolutely and unalterably opposed to the principle.

Hon. G. R. Coldwell on the same occasion declared that the initiative and referendum is neither a republican nor a British device; that it is not even democratic, but tends to tyranny and anarchy, and that it is impracticable and unworkable.

In the session of 1914 Direct Legislation received more attention at the hands of the government than at any previous session, the debate being taken up on three separate occasions. It was finally voted down by the straight government majority. C. D. McPherson again

introduced a resolution endorsing the principle of the initiative and referendum, and made a long and able speech on the subject. A week later Hon. Dr. Montague in a long speech assailed the principle and was followed by several government members. Dr. Montague sought to kill the McPherson resolution with an amendment, declaring that British institutions were the best and freest in the world, and that it was desirable that this form of government should be maintained unimpaired. T. H. Johnson offered an amendment to the amendment by adding "and more direct participation in the making of law by the agency of Direct Legislation is in direct accord with British principles of government". Mr. Johnson's amendment was voted down, 22 to 10, and the Montague amendment was carried, the opposition refraining from voting.

On February 4, 1913, a deputation from the Direct Legislation League of Manitoba waited on the Premier and Hon. G. R. Coldwell and asked that the principle of Direct Legislation be submitted to an early vote of the people of the province. Sir Rodmond refused to make any such promise, but Mr. Coldwell hinted that the government might favor the appointment of a commission to investigate the workings of the system elsewhere. Since that time nothing has been heard of the proposed commission. In asking for a popular vote, the Direct Legislation League presented a petition, which, it is claimed, was signed by 8,600 bona fide voters of the province.

WHAT DIRECT LEGISLATION IS

Direct Legislation or the initiative and referendum as a method or means of reform in the system of popular government by the people is receiving greater recognition and support in all countries where the masses take an interest in the conduct of public affairs.

Under this system when the electors desire a reform or any enactment of importance aside from the ordinary conduct of routine public affairs they may initiate a petition. If a certain percentage of the electors (5 to 10 per cent is the usual number) are in favor of such enactment or legislation they sign the petition and the proposition is submitted as a referendum or plebiscite to the popular vote and if approved by a majority of the electors becomes law.

Under the same principle if a government passes legislation which is not approved by the people they may, on petition, demand that before the law goes into effect it shall be submitted to the electors. With Direct Legislation in force any important measures passed by a government would not go into effect for 60 to 90 days, and in the meantime any opposed to the law could circulate their petition and if sufficient signers were secured, demand a vote or referendum.

The principle underlying Direct Legislation is the same principle on a broader basis that now prevails in municipalities. Any project or proposition which is of general interest or involves large or new expenditure and which is out of the ordinary conduct of municipal affairs must be submitted to the electors by by-law, or, as it really is, a referendum.

This system has been successfully tried in many countries and states. Switzerland in Europe has secured clean government and many

reforms under its operation, and it is admittedly one of the best governed countries in the world. Many states in the Union to the south have taken it up and in some forty or more the principle is approved. Oregon in particular has had great experience with Direct Legislation, and in this state where its test has been greatest and its workings best understood the sentiment is strongest in its favor. In every state where adopted the principle has been adhered to and there is no disposition to go back to the old plan of electing members and giving them full scope for four or five years without any check whatever upon them.

A True British Principle

Premier Roblin has denounced the principle of Direct Legislation as not being in harmony with British constitutional methods of government. Notwithstanding his denunciations, however, eminent British statesmen, such as Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Salisbury and others, have declared that the referendum principle is sound, and in accord with British ideas of government because the great principle underlying the British system is a government by the people and Direct Legislation provides for and protects that principle to a greater extent than any other method or plan yet devised.

In such truly British countries as the Australian states and in South Africa the principle is followed in deciding many leading questions. A referendum has also been urged by many people in Great Britain to settle such vexed problems as the Irish Home Rule question and Woman Suffrage.

Up to the present in Western Canada five provincial political parties have endorsed the principle, namely the Conservatives in Alberta and Saskatchewan, the Liberals in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. This fact indicates the progress of sentiment on the prairies in favor of greater and more direct control by the people over their laws and legislators.

One of the greatest advantages of this system is the fact that the people can decide any matter of special importance on its merits just as a business proposition should be decided, and without political prejudice or personalities that are always a marked feature of campaigns under the present system where the personnel of the candidates is also of much importance.

Better and cleaner government would result because large deals could not be rushed through between railways or corporations and governments without being submitted to the electors and thus there would be a desirable check on parliaments, governments and legislators in the intermissions between election contests.

Direct Legislation would also help to eliminate to some extent strong or deep-rooted partisanship in the conduct of provincial affairs because the people would get into the habit of settling large issues by direct vote on the merits of such issue.

Advantages Claimed for the Referendum

Among the advantages claimed for the referendum in its effect upon the course of legislation are these:

1. That it provides for intentional or unintentional misrepresentation on the part of elected legislatures and secures laws conformable to the actual will of the majority.

2. That it enhances the popular confidence in the stability of law.
3. That it eliminates much waste of political energy by enabling proposals of unknown value to be submitted separately to a quantitative test.

With the exception of Oregon where a large number of laws have been submitted directly to the people, the initiative and referendum have not been largely used—the effect of the provision being to ensure caution on the part of legislatures. From the adoption of the Swiss Federal constitution in 1874 up to June 1906 the optional referendum was applied to 29 laws, of these ten were accepted.

J. A. Hobson, the eminent English political writer, says:

"Laws drafted with the knowledge that they may be put to the test of a popular vote are less rigorous in their form and the practice of this art of accommodation ensures a process of investigation and discussion before the final form of the law is reached that is far more thorough than the procedure of a purely representative government with full legislative powers."

A Check on Hasty Legislation

Everywhere the effect of the referendum has been to check or destroy hasty legislation. Mr. Hobson, summing up the experience of Switzerland, says: "In general it may be said that the referendum discloses a truly serviceable strain of conservatism in the people. They will not vote for any large measure of centralized radicalism suddenly thrust before them."

The final and weightiest claim for the referendum, as attested by the experience of all communities where it has been tried, is the training in the art of government it gives the people. It may, indeed, be questioned whether a people whose direct contribution to self-government consists in a single vote cast at intervals of several years, not for a policy or even for a measure, but for a party or a personality, can be a genuinely self-governing people. Some amount of regular responsibility for concrete acts of conduct is surely as essential to the education of a self-reliant people as of a self-reliant individual. The believer in the referendum holds that the obligation imposed upon each citizen to take a direct part in the making of the laws he is called upon to obey is essential to the reality of popular self-government.

Roblin, the Political Acrobat

In his attitude towards Direct Legislation in 1913, Sir Rodmond Roblin gives one more striking illustration of his facility as a political acrobat. The same Roblin who in 1913 declared Direct Legislation to be "inapplicable, unwarranted, socialistic and un-British" voiced very different views in 1902, when he killed the Hugh John Macdonald Liquor Act by a corrupt referendum. In 1902 he was the out-and-out and vehement defender of the referendum, and his government in an official document to the then Minister of Justice, flouted the suggestion of the temperance forces that the referendum was unconstitutional.

In the course of the opposition to the Roblin government's resort to a referendum in 1902 in order to do away foully with the Macdonald Act, the Dominion Alliance sent a petition to the Privy Council at

Ottawa praying that the Roblin Referendum Act be disallowed. The Roblin government at once drew up a memorial to the Privy Council, by way of rebuttal of that petition.

Here is an extract from that memorial of the Roblin government dated March 27, 1902, in defence of the Roblin Referendum Act and of the referendum principle:

"Your government must most respectfully decline to accept the statements in the petition that the aforesaid reference 'would be subversive of the principles of representative and responsible government, and contrary to the usage and repugnant to the spirit of the constitution and injurious to the dignity and prerogative of the Crown.' On the contrary, your government earnestly urges that in ascertaining the wishes of the people as intended by the Referendum Act, your government is acting in strict accordance with constitutional principles, in conformity with both dominion and provincial precedents."

It is of interest and importance to note that the memorial was referred to the then Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, now the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, who upheld Premier Roblin's able defence of the referendum as being thoroughly constitutional and British.

"Those who take the view that the referendum is unconstitutional," writes Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in that state paper, "have evidently been misled in perusal of the American authorities upon which they rely, in failing to distinguish the constitutional principles which govern in the United States from those which govern in Canada." After citing certain judicial utterances in the United States to the effect that "the legislature cannot under the constitution delegate to the people or to any tribunal, powers which are strictly legislative," Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, upholding Premier Roblin's argument in the memorial, declares:

"Such considerations have no place in the British system, where the authority of parliament is not limited by any constitutional instrument, and where the power of parliament to delegate its functions is incontestably established."

And still further, in support of Premier Roblin's demonstration in 1902 that the referendum principle is both British and constitutional, that state paper on record at Ottawa says:

"Although the principle sanctioned by this Referendum Act may be unusual, and even if it were without precedent, it is not therefore in any wise unconstitutional, either in the sense of changing the constitution of the province, or otherwise; and if it were intended to change the constitution of the province, the undersigned observes that this is one of the powers expressly conferred upon the legislature, except so far as regards the office of the lieutenant-governor."

Interpretation of Liberal Policy

The Direct Legislation League of Manitoba recently asked for an expression from the Liberal party of its exact attitude and intentions with regard to Direct Legislation and for an interpretation of the Direct Legislation plank in the Liberal platform. This was outlined in a letter to the president of the league from T. H. Johnson, M.P.P., West Winnipeg, as follows:

"Dr. J. N. Hutchison,
Winnipeg.

"Dear Sir:—Answering your communication relative to my conception of Direct Legislation, I wish to say I would favor a good honest measure, free from all jokers or other clauses which would render it ineffective, or which would tend to weaken the usefulness of such a measure.

"While it would be out of the question at the present time to give the necessary details of such a measure, its broad principles might be indicated as follows, all of which would have my hearty support:

1. The application of the referendum and the initiative should be mandatory and not optional with the government.
2. It should be applicable to all legislation of whatever nature, with the two following exceptions:
 - (a) Ordinary current expenses of government.
 - (b) Measures of a purely emergent character, which should be operative at once, subject however, to a referendum if desired at a later date.
3. Necessary petitions should not be onerous and should not exceed the customary percentages in vogue in jurisdictions where the principles in question have been successfully applied.
4. A government publicity pamphlet (such as used in Oregon) to be furnished the electors giving the leading arguments for and stating against measures submitted to them.
5. Should Direct Legislation be found to be ultra vires it should still be used in an advisory capacity to give effect to the findings of the people until the necessary constitutional changes could be secured to incorporate it into our constitution.

"All of which is respectfully submitted

"Sincerely yours,

"THOS. H. JOHNSON."

This letter was then sent to the Liberal leader, Mr. T. C. Norris, and he replied to the president endorsing explicitly Mr. Johnson's statements.

Finances of the Province

The direct debt of the Province of Manitoba on November 30, 1913, as set forth in the public accounts of Manitoba for 1913, page 160, is made up of the following items:

The Direct Debt.

1888—Loan	\$1,498,933
1893—Loan	997,866
1900—Loan	500,000
1907—Telephone Construction	1,000,000
1907—Bell Telephone Purchase	3,399,853
1909—Telephone Construction	499,806
1910—Telephone Construction	2,690,666
1910—Elevator System	1,000,000
1911—Elevator System	1,825,000
1912—Loan Retiring Treasury Bills	1,400,000
1913—Loan for Buildings	1,946,666
Various Municipal Telephone Purchases ..	177,000
	<hr/>
	\$16,995,590

The two first loans amounting to \$2,496,599, date back to the Greenway regime. The balance of the indebtedness has been incurred during the life time of the present government.

Public Utilities Owned by Province

A considerable proportion of this debt is represented by the telephone system and the grain elevators owned by the government. The telephone system represents a capital outlay of \$11,047,473, as shown in the balance sheet of the public accounts for 1913, page 4.

In the public accounts of the province an indebtedness of \$1,000,000 on behalf of the elevator system is shown. This, as a matter of fact, is not correct, the total outlay on elevators having amounted to \$1,180,000. The additional \$180,000 is part of the loan issued May 5, 1912, retiring treasury bills outstanding on that date. In a statement issued in London by the government in connection with a prospectus for a Manitoba loan in May, 1913, the elevators were included in the assets of the province at a valuation of only \$1,000,000, thus showing that the government has already written off \$180,000 of the capital invested in this utility.

Neither of these public utilities contribute to the public revenues. They barely pay their way. In 1913 the telephones had a surplus, according to the public accounts, of only \$37,914, equal to three-tenths of 1 per cent of the capital invested. Of this surplus all but some \$4,000 was put back into the maintenance fund.

The elevator system last year netted the province only \$615, while in the two previous years the province lost \$124,000 in their operation without taking into account the depreciation in value. In addition the elevators were made exempt from municipal taxation, which constituted a burden on the electors where these elevators were located.

Accumulated Surpluses

In his budget on January 29, 1914, Hon. Hugh Armstrong announced that the accumulated surpluses of the Roblin government during its term of office had reached the total of \$7,251,206. But where is the

money? The accumulated cash on hand November 30 (public accounts, 1913, page 4) amounted to only \$769,970. This shows that in addition to increasing the public debt by nearly \$14,000,000 the government has spent, during their fourteen years of office, out of the accumulated surpluses no less than \$6,491,236.

The explanation of the government is that this money has been spent in erecting and furnishing necessary public buildings. As to what has been actually spent for buildings there are serious discrepancies in the records. In the balance sheet as shown in the public accounts for 1913, page 4, the amount was given as \$7,940,948, whereas is an official statement in a provincial prospectus published in London, April 12, 1913, the amount expended in buildings is given as \$5,329,057.

Where the Surpluses Came From

If it were true that the government had built these public buildings out of savings from ordinary revenue it would be to their credit. In point of fact, however, the money that went into these buildings was obtained by jobbing off, at much less than their value, the public resources of the province.

When the Roblin government came into office it inherited a landed estate amounting to 1,744,873 acres, made up of swamp lands, 957,536 acres; M. and N. W. lands, 531,337 acres; and Hudson's Bay Railway lands, 256,000 acres. In the last ten years, there have been transferred to the province by the Dominion government 1,047,903 acres of swamp lands, bringing the total amount of land entrusted to the Roblin government for administration to 2,792,776 acres.

The Roblin government has sold \$38,481 acres of swamp lands, 518,681 acres of M. and N. W. lands, and 256,000 of Hudson's Bay Railway lands. These figures are all from official sources, but, as will be seen by a reference to the detailed statistics of the land sales (page 66) they are actually too small by over 84,700 acres. They show the sale of 1,613,162 acres of public lands. To date the government has secured from these sales, as shown by the annual statements of the Land Department, the sum of \$5,547,198.

Of this amount the swamp lands, according to a statement made by Hon. Hugh Armstrong at Portage la Prairie, March 25, 1914, have contributed \$2,769,856. This makes the receipts from the railway lands \$2,777,342. Out of this total the government paid in 1910 debentures issued originally by the M. and N. W. Railway and the Hudson Bay Railway, for which the province was liable, to the value of \$1,043,406, leaving a balance in favor of the government of \$1,733,936.

As a condition of the boundary settlement in 1912, the province reconveyed to the Dominion government 1,170,883 acres of swamp land, and gave up their right to 6,223,467 additional acres of swamp land, or, in all, 7,400,000 acres (statement by Hon. R. L. Borden in the House of Commons February 27, 1912). At \$3.00 an acre, which has always been the official estimated value of these lands, this was equivalent to a capital sum of \$22,200,000.

The Manitoba government got out of this boundary adjustment a cash payment of \$2,193,357, which amount is included in the total sur-

plus claimed by Mr. Armstrong. This sum can be fairly claimed as being the result of selling the natural resources of the provinces.

A recapitulation of the amounts received by the government from the sale of public lands makes the following showing:—

Received from swamp lands	\$2,769,856
Surplus from railway lands	1,733,936
Cash from Ottawa re boundary settlement	2,193,357
	<hr/>
	\$6,697,149

This far more than covers the cost of the buildings as given in the government prospectus published in London in May, 1913.

It is thus quite apparent that the aggregate surpluses upon which the Roblin government prides itself, and which it has expended in buildings, were the result, not of careful administration of the provincial finances, but of reckless realization upon the assets of the province. The transaction represents a mere shifting of assets. The province has exchanged assets which were rapidly increasing in value and which, if duly conserved, would have been a source of perpetual revenue, for buildings the value of which is relatively less year by year.

DEBT WILL GROW RAPIDLY.

The debt, large as it is, must continue to grow rapidly during the next few years. The government is committed to a capital expenditure on buildings during 1914, of \$3,000,000. There will be further outlay in future years to complete the new Parliament buildings. The government, under the Good Roads Act, will also be called upon to pay out \$2,500,000 within the next three years.

Where is this money to come from? There is no accumulation of funds from past surpluses to meet this expenditure. The cash in hand at the close of 1913 amounted to only \$769,970, a decrease during the preceding twelve months of \$266,340. The annual surpluses can no longer be counted upon to reach large figures. In 1913 the total receipts of the province amounted to \$5,788,069, and the expenditures to \$5,314,848. This gave a surplus on consolidated revenue of \$473,221. Of this amount no less than \$323,000 was received from lands, a source of revenue which is temporary. It will disappear entirely within the next five or six years. The ordinary revenues of the province, swollen temporarily by land receipts which are capital, barely suffice to meet the ordinary expenditures, and in the event of a shrinkage in any department (as in succession duties, for which \$500,000 was estimated for 1914), the surplus might disappear entirely.

It is therefore clear that in order to meet the building and good roads programmes of the government, it will be necessary to go on the London money market, and ask for at least \$2,000,000 a year for a term of years. That amount of money was borrowed in 1913 and spent, and an equal amount will have to be borrowed during the year 1914, and in succeeding years, until the commitments made by the government are fulfilled.

The province is now paying 4½ per cent for its money, the highest rate since 1888. At this rate every \$2,000,000 borrowed imposes an additional charge of \$100,000 upon the annual revenue; it will take but a

few years to wipe out the present narrow margin between income and outgo. It is therefore plain that unless new sources of taxation are found, or a policy of economy is adopted, the annual income of the province within a few years will fail to meet the demands made upon it.

The impaired position of the province has already been noted in the money markets, which are sensitive registers of the credit of a nation. In 1890, the last loan quoted by the Greenway government, \$100,000 of drainage debentures, bearing 4 per cent interest, was sold at 111, which was the best rate ever accorded the province. In May, 1913, the Province of Manitoba put a loan on the British market at 4½ per cent interest, and floated it at 102. That is to say, though the interest rate was ½ per cent higher than in 1890 there was a drop of 9 points in the price obtained.

Reduction in Expenditure Possible

An inspection of the public accounts shows that large savings in the expenditures of the province could be made by a policy calling for efficiency and economy. A comparison between the cost of civil government, often called the cost of "running the machine," for the last year of the Greenway government, 1899, and for 1913, shows an inordinate increase in the intervening period. As the comparison shown in the subjoined tables is between the same items for each year it is perfectly fair:

COST OF RUNNING THE MACHINE, 1899 AND 1913.

	1899.	1913.
Legislation	\$ 36,481	\$151,206
Executive Council	32,311	26,234
Treasury	7,355	25,596
Provincial Secretary	6,089	15,693
Education	19,087	189,542
Agriculture and Immigration	14,247	*102,420
Attorney-General	124,516	563,490
Provincial Lands	6,750	12,265
Railway Commissioners	319	800
Public Works	28,360	190,344
Municipal Commissioner	3,259	4,711
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$277,205	\$1,282,301

*Agricultural College expenses are not included.

The population of the province has, of course, increased during the intervening years, with a corresponding increase in the demand upon the government. But the growth of the expenditures has been out of all proportion to the growth of population. According to the Dominion government estimates of population, upon which the provincial subsidy was paid, there were in Manitoba in 1899 193,425 people, while in 1913 the population was 461,630. Thus the population increased during these 14 years by 138 per cent, while expenditures for civil government increased 366 per cent on the per capita basis; it cost in 1899, \$1.43 per head to run the machine, while in 1913 the amount had risen to \$2.77 per head.

The Greenway government entered office in 1888, pledged to reduce by \$50,000 the cost of "running the machine". In their first year of office they saved \$120,601.

PUBLIC LANDS

The following table has been compiled from the annual reports of the Provincial Land Department, supplemented by information obtained from special returns brought down to the legislature. It shows the lands sold by the province each year from 1900 to 1913. For 1910 and 1911 there are no available figures showing the relative proportions of swamp and railway lands sold; thus only the totals are given. The total for the 14 years is in round figures 1,700,000 acres. These are the detailed figures of sale, showing the amounts disposed of and the average price per acre:

Year.	Lands.	Acres.	Price.	Ave.
1900	M. and N. W.	10,178	\$30,534	\$2.99
1901	M. and N. W.	97,375	302,605	3.10
1902	M. and N. W.	201,055	803,957	3.98
1903	M. and N. W.	86,302	348,159	4.00
1904	M. and N. W.	9,657	36,807	4.06
1904	H. B. R.	256,000	400,000	1.56
1905	M. and N. W.	3,087	14,957	4.05
1906	M. and N. W.	20,811	132,906	4.95
1907	M. and N. W.	8,687	48,833	5.62
1908	M. and N. W.	4,548	24,043	5.48
1909	M. and N. W.	5,439	32,635	6.00
1900-9	Swamp	728,900	2,460,606	3.38
1910	Both	142,535	737,395	5.17
1911	"	89,109	577,295	6.47
1912	M. and N. W.	22,367	129,374	5.78
1913	M. and N. W.	4,536	34,856	7.68
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		1,697,936	6,153,950	3.63

Millions Lost by Mismanagement

The prices obtained for these lands were unduly low. This applied particularly to the M. and N. W. lands, which were carefully selected railway lands in the Quill Lake district in Saskatchewan. Of the 542,560 acres of land obtained by the province from the M. and N. W. railway in 1899 in payment of its liability to the province on account of debenture assistance given it, there had been sold by 1910 no less than 485,000 at an average price of \$3.88 per acre. The average rose in 1912 to \$5.78, and in 1913 to \$7.68; but the average for the whole amount sold to date, some 520,000 acres, has been less than \$4 per acre.

This land is of much the same quality as the school lands in Saskatchewan, which were sold in 1906 at an average of \$14.32 an acre; 1907, \$14.67; 1908, \$15.21; 1909, \$15.98. The difference in price is accounted for by the difference in the selling methods. The school lands were advertised and sold at public auction; the M. and N. W. lands were jobbed out at private sale to party friends.

T. C. Norris, in a speech in the legislature, 1910, estimated that the province has lost at least five million dollars by the wasteful administration of the lands by the Roblin government. This amount has been augmented by further sales during the past four years.

RECEIPTS FROM LANDS

Over 5½ Millions from Provincial Lands

The receipts from provincial lands during the past fourteen years were as follows:—

1900		\$ 63,027
1901		120,566
1902		256,916
1903		202,742
1904		277,202
1905		446,752
1906		543,788
1907		463,254
1908		427,867
1909		575,298
1910		515,298
1911		648,848
1912		575,025
1913		400,013

Total \$5,547,198

This is made up of instalments of principal and interest upon deferred payments. There are still deferred payments, amounting to over two million dollars, which will go to swell the normal revenues of the province for a few more years.

The cessation of revenue from lands is however plainly in view. According to the report of the provincial lands department for 1913 the land still owned by the province amounts only to 43,749 acres.

Additional details of land transactions will be found in the 1910 Liberal Handbook, pages 46 to 50.

Revenue at Expense of Municipalities

In obtaining their revenues the Roblin government has displayed considerable ingenuity, and largely at the expense of the municipalities. For instance, they have collected from \$100,000 per annum, tax from the railway corporations up to as much as \$205,358 for 1913. By virtue of this arrangement, however, all railway properties in all municipalities are exempt from tax levies. In other words, the government directs all taxes from railways into the provincial or central treasury while municipal property owners have to make up the shortage locally by increased levies on their properties, and in addition must provide local roads, sidewalks, police and fire protection.

In the corporation tax the same principle obtains to a limited extent.

The automobile license is another feature of taxation which is all directed to the central treasury. Approximately, \$35,000 to \$40,000 per annum is collected for auto license and number plates. This all goes direct to the provincial treasury, while the municipalities must pay for upkeep of the highways, of which auto owners get so much use. It is necessary and desirable that corporations and railways be taxed, but in this respect it might be pointed out that these levies come out of the people, and that the dividends to shareholders have not been reduced as a result, neither has benefit accrued to the province or its people as a whole, because it has required practically all this increased revenue to keep up the cost of running the Roblin government political machine paid out of the public treasury, under the head of civil service, road grants, etc.

The injustice to municipalities in the matter of the taxation question was brought up in the legislature at the 1914 session, in the form

of a resolution asking for a readjustment under the direction of the Public Utilities Commissioner. This was rejected by the government, and voted down.

NOTES ON THE PROVINCES FINANCES

The annual revision of the voters' list has been opposed by the Liberals as an unnecessary waste of money. Since the annual revision was inaugurated in 1904 there has been spent for this purpose no less than \$195,138. If lists had been made only for the two election years, 1907 and 1910, a saving of \$125,000 could have been made in this respect alone.

Another feature of waste is the large quantity of supplies purchased without tender for government institutions. Clothing, etc., is bought annually, totalling many thousands in this respect. There is room for an enormous saving in the conduct of public business by eliminating waste, and applying fair business methods.

While the city of Winnipeg has made a financial success of its hydro-electric power system, after cutting the rates formerly charged by the private corporation in two, the government of Manitoba has operated its public utilities—the telephones and the elevators—at a loss.

By exercising pressure to force the Manitoba University to remove to the agricultural college site at St. Vital the government was responsible for the loss of the Heubach-Tuxedo site, worth \$800,000, after \$20,000 of public money had been expended on the site in the expectation that the university would be placed there.

Large amounts of public money are wasted in the payments which appear in the public accounts under the title "aid to municipalities." The payments on this account during recent years have been:—1907, \$142,789; 1908, \$216,203; 1909, \$149,785; 1910, \$223,617; 1911, \$199,983; 1912, \$236,069; 1913, \$287,499; 1914 (as provided for in the estimates), \$400,000. The figures for 1913 were swollen by the expenditure of over \$93,000 in Gimli. Most of the money expended in this way is spent directly by the government through its agents on the ground; and a large percentage of this is applied to keeping the political machine running smoothly. The voting of \$400,000 for 1914 indicates that a large resort to these methods will be made in the coming campaign.

In 1900 in the Hugh John Macdonald government the paid cabinet ministers numbered three. In 1901 the number was increased to five; in 1908 to six; and in 1913 to seven, by the addition of Hon. J. E. Bernier in the cabinet.

In the election of 1907 Premier Roblin chartered a special train from the C. P. R. for electioneering purposes, and paid the bill, which amounted to \$541, out of the public treasury. (Voucher No. 1157, page 141, sessional papers of 1908). The defence made in the House was that this campaigning tour was in the interests of the country.

The increase in the cost of "running the machine" for the year 1913 over the figures for 1899, the last year of the Greenway regime, is greater by \$227,863 than the whole revenue of the province in the latter year.

ENORMOUS PAYMENTS TO THE WINNIPEG TELEGRAM

* Payments to the Winnipeg Telegram during the last 14 years, so far as they are set forth in the Public Accounts, have been as follows:

1900	\$ 2,392.22
1901	7,365.81
1902	23,041.35
1903	25,514.74
1904	17,031.87
1905	20,745.55
1906	23,433.82
1907	25,871.22
1908	28,808.52
1909	28,036.02
1910	30,269.77
1911	37,454.63
1912	39,522.05
1913	57,475.40

\$367,295.21

This does not include payments by the telephone commission, which are estimated as running near \$12,000 a year.

Railways

When the last Liberal government of Manitoba went out of office in January, 1900, there were three railway systems, the C.P.R., the Northern Pacific, and the Canadian Northern serving the province. The Canadian Northern was operating a considerable mileage, and was at work building its line between Winnipeg and Port Arthur.

A 10-Cent Rate Arranged

Soon after taking office Mr. Hugh John Macdonald signed a contract with J. P. McDonald, of New York, for a fourth competing railway, with an outlet to Duluth. This contract with one of the leading railroad builders of the United States was ready to be submitted to the legislature for ratification when Mr. Roblin replaced Mr. Macdonald. This contract was cancelled by Mr. Roblin, and knowledge of it suppressed until Mr. J. P. McDonald made it public.

This contract provided for a line to Duluth, and for between three and four hundred miles of railway in Manitoba, the province to guarantee the interest on \$10,000 per mile on the mileage in Manitoba, and on \$15,000 per mile on the Minnesota mileage, in return for which 51 per cent of the stock was to be deposited with the railway commissioner of Manitoba, the province was to appoint the controller and auditor of the company, and there were to be specific freight rate reductions, the grain rate being fixed at 10 cents, with passenger rates not to exceed 2½ cents per mile between stations in Manitoba. A penalty of \$10,000 was provided for each and every violation by the company of the agreement as to rates.

By cancelling this contract Mr. Roblin threw away all chance of getting a ten-cent rate on wheat to the lake front.

The 10-Cent Rate Roblin's Ideal

It was the more remarkable that Mr. Roblin should have thus abandoned the 10-cent rate to the lake since in his first speech as Premier at East Poplar Point, 1900, Mr. Roblin held up the 10-cent rate as the ideal to be aspired to. On that occasion he said:

"The ideal figure is a rate on wheat to Lake Superior of ten cents a hundred and six cents a bushel. That is the goal my government has in view. I am not able to make a statement of the means which will ensure such a rate, yet it is the goal towards which we are going, and I, as first minister, will not rest until we have secured such a rate for the farmers of Manitoba."

Nearly 13 years have passed, and the 10-cent rate is still a dream! As the record shows, the Roblin government has put its realization beyond the bounds of achievement.

The Capture of the Northern Pacific

The Roblin government—in fulfilment, it was claimed at the time, of the party's pledge of "government ownership of railways"—made an agreement with the Northern Pacific, dated January 1, 1901, by which the province took over the Northern Pacific mileage in Manitoba for 999 years, at an annual rental of \$210,000 for the first ten years,

\$225,000 for the second ten years, \$275,000 for the third ten years, and \$300,000 per year for the remainder of the continuance of the lease, with the option of purchase for \$7,000,000. On February 11, 1901, the government transferred the lease and option to the C. N. R. the legislature ratifying this transfer, passed at the session of 1901, provided also for a guarantee of bonds upon the Ontario and Rainy River section of the Canadian Northern railway to the extent of \$20,000 per mile for 200 miles. In return the government took power to fix freight rates over the C. N. R. mileage in Manitoba and between Manitoba and Port Arthur—with the proviso that if the reduction exceeded 4 cents per 100 on grain to the lake front, or 15 per cent on other freight the province becomes liable for any deficiency which may arise.

Government Declined a Freight Reduction

And in moving the second reading of the bill, ratifying the C. N. R. agreement, on March 6, 1901, Mr. Roblin said:

"The right to control these rates was not obtained without considerable argument and negotiations. They (the C. N. R.) undertook, on their part, to try and prove that it was better to have a fixed rate—that we should have an immediate reduction say of twenty per cent. on the tariffs of the C. P. R. as they existed, but I did not agree with them, for, while ten cents may be a fair and reasonable rate today, five years from now it may be an exorbitant one."

It will be noted that Mr. Roblin here admits that he rejected an immediate reduction of twenty per cent. in the tariff because he preferred to retain the control of rates with a view not only of bringing the rate down to a ten cent basis, but ultimately of reducing it to a still lower figure. The 20 per cent reduction has never been made; the ten cent rate on wheat has not been reached—and the government control of rates has lapsed.

Claimed Full Control

Mr. Roblin claimed that by this arrangement the Manitoba government had complete control over the C. N. R. On the second reading of the C. N. R. bill on March 6, 1901, he said:

"I claim that in the bill before the House we have all the practical benefits of government ownership without the disadvantages of having to operate the road through a department of the government or a commission the government might appoint. We have exactly what a government railway would be expected to give the people, namely, control of the rates. We have escaped all the dangers of government ownership, and secured all that is practically beneficial and desirable, and practically all that the people require. . . . There I say we have done well to avoid the dangerous part of government ownership, whilst securing that which is practical and beneficial."

In Winnipeg in April, 1903, Mr. Roblin said: "The railway policy had resulted in giving the government everything that was required in the way of control of rates and to the same extent as if they had mortgaged the province for fifteen or twenty millions and built the lines themselves. So absolute was the control of the rates that the government could reduce them to any point they saw fit."

On June 7, 1908, at Neepawa, Mr. Roblin repeated the claim:—
“Under our contract of 1901 we have secured government control over the rates of the Canadian Northern without the expenditure of a dollar. Not one cent has Mackenzie and Mann, or the Canadian Northern Railway Company received from the Province of Manitoba, and we have the absolute and unconditional control of rates.”

Railway Passes from Government's Jurisdiction

In 1909, however, Mr. Roblin repudiated the claim that the government had any control over freight rates on the C. N. R. In August, 1909, D. W. McCuaig, on behalf of the Grain Growers' Association, wrote to the premier, making complaint of alleged excessive rates on wheat between Gilbert Plains and various points on the C. N. R. system, and asking the premier to deal with the matter. Writing to McCuaig in reply, on Sept. 8, 1909, Mr. Roblin said:

“I presume you are aware that the statute creating the railway commission of Canada was passed subsequent to the contract made between the Canadian Northern and the Province of Manitoba, and that the statute provides that the matter of rates and every other thing in connection with the operation of railways that has been declared to be of general benefit to Canada, are subject to that commission.”

Thus Mr. Roblin sought to shunt the control from the province to the railway commission.

Subsequently, on September 28, 1909, Mr. Roblin wrote Mr. McCuaig further, enclosing a letter to him from G. H. Shaw, traffic manager of the C. N. R. In this letter, Mr. Shaw claimed that the rates on the current tariff showed a reduction from the rates in force in the Province of Manitoba on the C. P. R. lines, on Feb. 11, 1901, the date of the signing of the C. N. R. contract, of 15 per cent, and he held that this must be accepted as “the full limit of reduction under the Act.” Mr. Roblin accepted Mr. Shaw's statement, apparently without any independent inquiry on his part, and in his letter to Mr. McCuaig referred to it as a “very effective reply.” “Therefore,” said Mr. Roblin, “every condition had been fulfilled that was stipulated in the agreement with the province.” He concludes his letter by informing Mr. McCuaig that the C. N. R. has “passed beyond the jurisdiction of the province.”

Slight Reduction on Wheat

The net result of the C. N. R. bargain, so far as rates on outgoing wheat are concerned, was a reduction of three cents a hundred on the freight rate to the lake from all points west of Winnipeg, and four cents from Winnipeg and points east. The rate from the latter points is a ten cent one, but its effect is nominal, as little or no wheat originates at these stations. Throughout the province, west of Winnipeg, the rate is just three cents a bushel less than it was when the Roblin government came into office thirteen years ago.

During the twelve years of the Greenway government the freight rate from Manitoba points to the lake front dropped 10c. per hundred pounds—from 24c. to 14c.

THE GUARANTEE OF BONDS

In return for this small reduction in rates and for the contract over freight rates which has now lapsed, the province has assumed, for the purpose of assisting the Canadian Northern Railway, a contingent liability of over thirty million dollars. Herewith is given the details, year by year, of the bond guarantees given the Canadian Northern Railway by the Manitoba legislature.

Year		Miles	Rate
1896	1—Gladstone to Winnipegosis	125	\$ 8,000
1899	2—Winnipeg S. E. to Boundary	108	\$ 8,000
	3—Sifton Junction to Erwood	177	\$ 8,000

The above guarantees were given during the Greenway government's tenure of office. All subsequent guarantees have been given by the present provincial regime. To continue the recital:

Year		Miles	Rate
1900	4—Dauphin to Grandview	27	\$ 8,000
1902	5—(a) Carman Jet. to Carman, 70, (b) Neepawa Jet. via Carberry through Neepawa, 53; (c) Rossburn Extension to Clanwilliam, 20; (d) Beaver to Glad- stone, 18	161	\$ 8,000
	6—Winnipeg to Oak Point	55	
	For part		\$ 8,000
	For part		\$ 5,000

In 1902 the Roblin Government decided to increase all the guarantees shown above, adding an extra \$2,000 per mile to every previous guarantee of \$8,000 per mile, and adding \$5,000 per mile for that portion of the Winnipeg to Oak Point line which had been given at first \$5,000 per mile. That is to say, all the foregoing guarantees, granted in 1896, 1899, 1900 and 1902 were raised to the uniform rate of \$10,000 per mile, at which rate guarantees were granted until 1909, when the rate of guarantee was raised to \$13,000 per mile. To continue the tabulation:

Year		Miles	Rate
1903	8—Clanwillian, northwesterly, 80; Emerson, easterly, 20; McCreary Jet., southerly, 18; Hartney to Virden, 40; Roland to Morden, 20; Portage to Carberry, 40; Greenway extension, 40; Minto to Melita, 30; Thunderhill Br., 20; Fairfax Br., 15; Carberry Jet. to Carberry, 20	343	\$10,000
1905	9—Carberry west to Boundary	100	\$10,000
	10—Winnipeg east	25	\$10,000
	11—Above line to Bird's Hill Gravel Pit	7	\$10,000
	12—St. Charles cut-off	7	\$10,000
	13—Emerson-Sprague cut-off	50	\$10,000
1906	14—New Branch to Deloraine	35	\$10,000
	15—Oakland Northwesterly	50	\$10,000
	16—Oak Point Northwesterly	25	\$10,000

1907	17—Neepawa to the Boundary	\$0	\$10,000
	18—Virden Northwesterly	20	\$10,000
	19—Bird's Hill Northwesterly	15	\$10,000
1909	20—Hallboro to the Boundary	110	\$13,000
	21—Oak Point Northerly and Northwesterly	50	\$13,000
	22—McCreary to Winnipegosis	50	\$13,000
1910	23—Oakland to St. Rose du Lac	55	\$13,000
	24—Bird's Hill to Ft. Alexander	50	\$13,000
	25—From Oak Point spur northerly	40	\$13,000
1911	26—Oak Point extension	50	\$13,000
	27—Deloraine Westerly	60	\$13,000
	28—St. Rose du Lac Northwesterly	50	\$13,000
1912	29—Oak Point extension	150	\$13,000
1914	31—From Grand Marais to Victoria Beach..	15	\$13,000
	32—From Oak Pt. branch to Lake Manitoba, abt. tp. 27	12	\$13,000
	Total Mileage	2,099	
	Summary		
	1,407 miles at \$10,000		\$14,070,000
	692 miles at \$13,000		\$8,996,000
			<hr/> <u>\$23,066,000</u>

Not all these guarantees are in operation as yet, for the reason that not all the mileage in the above tabulation, for which there is statutory provision, has yet been constructed. The public accounts for the province's fiscal year ended November 30, 1913, laid on the table of the legislature by the Provincial Treasurer at the recent session, contain the latest official statement of the guarantees actually in operation. That statement shows that up to the date mentioned the total of Canadian Northern bonds on constructed mileage in Manitoba was then \$16,474,073.

In addition there is the \$3,000,000 guarantee granted in 1909 for the Winnipeg terminals, and there are two other items of older date, namely the \$5,745,586 Manitoba and South Eastern (Ontario Division) guarantee, dating from 1901, and the \$349,000 on the Canadian Northern mileage in Minnesota, also dating from 1901. Both these guarantees have been earned and are in operation. The last mentioned is a direct debt of the province, in the form of provincial bonds, the Canadian Northern being under obligation to pay the interest and to indemnify the province.

There is not included in this summing up the \$7,000,000 of Northern Pacific capital account for which the province stands sponsor.

To summarize, this is the present actual contingent liability assumed by the Province of Manitoba in the form of assistance to the Canadian Northern:

Guarantees on lines within the province	\$16,474,073
Guarantees on Ontario Division	5,745,586
Guarantees on Winnipeg Terminals	3,000,000
Minnesota Section	349,000
	<hr/>
Guarantees voted but not yet earned	\$25,568,659
	<hr/>
	6,592,000

The Roblin-Samuel Incident

PREMIER OF MANITOBA CALLS BRITISH CABINET MINISTER
A JELLY-BAG ENGLISHMAN

The calibre of the man who is premier of Manitoba is well shown in the extraordinary and outrageous attack made by Sir Rodmond Roblin on the Right Hon. Herbert Samuel, Postmaster General of Great Britain.

In a speech at a dinner given by the Montefiore Club in Montreal, at which he was the guest of honor, the Right Hon. Mr. Samuel said, as reported in the Montreal Star of October 9, 1913, in discussing educational matters in Manitoba:

"The educational advantages were, in most cases, real. There was one defect and a defect which might be made the subject of serious criticism, and that was that there was no system of compulsory education in Manitoba. He did not propose to enter deeply into a question which constituted one of the controversial aspects of Canadian politics, but he would at least say this, that the result of the system in Manitoba was lamentable. He had found that among the foreign children in the outskirts of Winnipeg, there were many who had left school with the most meagre of education and many others who had not been to school at all.

"I cannot," he said, "refrain from expressing pain that in one of the largest and most progressive provinces of the Dominion I should find a state of things existing almost a generation behind the rest of the civilized world to-day."

Principal Peterson Concurred

Following Mr. Samuel, Principal Peterson, of McGill University, heartily concurred in the sentiments expressed. He said:

"I feel deeply sorry for Manitoba and I am sure that no great city can enter her heritage or take care of the children on her streets aright until she has solved the problem of compulsory education."

The Jelly-Bag Speech

It was more than a month later, in a speech at Minnedosa on November 14, that Sir Rodmond made his extraordinary, vulgar and deliberate attack on Mr. Samuel. The Telegram of the following day, in a copy of the speech headed "Full Text of Address by Premier," which showed that it had been carefully prepared in advance, quoted Premier Roblin as referring to Mr. Samuel as

"A MEDDLESOME, IMPUDENT, SLANDEROUS SAMUEL, WHO BY ACCIDENT HOLDS A PORTFOLIO IN THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT, MAKING A FALSE STATEMENT AT THE DICTATION OF A SMALL GRIT COTERIE, WHO STUFFED THE JELLY-BAG ENGLISHMAN TO THE EXTENT THAT HE WAS WILLING TO MAKE A STATEMENT IN THE CITY OF MONTREAL THAT WAS FALSE IN EVERY PARTICULAR AND WHICH HE KNEW TO BE FALSE."

This is the language which the Premier prepared in advance. In that "Full Text," Premier Roblin said that if Mr. Samuel ever visited Manitoba again, he would be

"MADE TO SWALLOW HIS FALSEHOODS EVEN THOUGH THEY STRANGLED HIM TO THE EXTENT OF COMPELLING HIM TO MAKE A CONFESSION THAT HE WAS STUFFED."

The Actual Speech

A stenographic report of the actual speech by the Premier shows that he said at Minnedosa

"THAT JELLY-BAG ENGLISHMAN WAITED UNTIL HE GOT ONE FOOT ON THE SHIP AT MONTREAL, AND THEN HURLED HIS FALSE AND LYING STATEMENTS WHICH WERE INSPIRED BY MEN, FRENZIED WITH RAGE BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT OUST THE ROBLIN GOVERNMENT."

Further, if Mr. Samuel

"HAD DARED TO MAKE SUCH STATEMENTS IN WINNIPEG HIS HIDE WOULD HAVE BEEN HARPOONED IN A HUNDRED PLACES."

And further

"THAT INFLATED GRAMPUS FROM ENGLAND WAS INSPIRED BY THE FREE PRESS TO LIE IN ORDER TO EMBARRASS THE ROBLIN GOVERNMENT."

Mr. Samuel Replies

News of the Premier's speech was cabled to England and the Right Hon. Mr. Samuel gave an interview to the Canadian Associated Press, which was cabled to Winnipeg. He expressed astonishment and explained how on the occasion of his visit in Montreal he was asked to give his impressions of the West. In doing so he had mentioned that he had been specially struck with the zeal of the people of these Provinces for education, the only exception he had observed being Manitoba, where there was no system of compulsory education. His statement was based on information he had received from more than one educationist in Winnipeg where, as well as in several other places, he had visited a number of elementary schools. His remarks, he recalled, were indorsed by Principal Peterson, of McGill University.

The Premier Again

Interviewed by the Telegram on the London cablegram, Premier Roblin renewed his attack, and among other things said: "I would suggest to the Right Hon. Mr. Asquith that before he allows Mr. Samuel to visit this Province again, he should give him a course in some kindergarten where they teach good manners, because a more gross breach of hospitality was never committed in the British Empire than that of which Mr. Samuel was guilty."

And again, he referred to Mr. Samuel as "making false statements about his neighbors which no good citizen will ever do."

The Telegram's Coarse Attack

The Winnipeg Telegram, the personal organ of Premier Roblin, went quite as far as the Premier himself in its editorial abuse. "Liar" and "Cowardly shirker" were among the epithets used in the first editorial following the report of the Montreal speech. The Telegram said, in part: "No finer specimen of a pestilential partisan could have

been produced than Right Hon. Herbert Samuel"; also, "He has dishonored the public life of Great Britain"; "He waited till he got one foot on an ocean liner to emit the falsehoods supplied him by politicians with sinister purposes in the West, whose willing tool he showed himself"; "To be a cowardly meddler in things which do not concern him is what might be expected from a cowardly shirker of the consequences of his action in things that do."

Following the publication of Mr. Samuel's interview in London, the Telegram said: "Mr. Samuel may explain and explain until he is black in the face. The statement he repeated is a lie. He acted like a cad in going behind the back of the Province in which he had been treated with hospitality, to spread injurious reports affecting its good name."

Sir Rodmond's Apology

The Premier's utterances naturally aroused intense resentment among Englishmen throughout Manitoba, who took them as a deliberate insult, not only to a distinguished British public man, but to all men of the English race. Sir Rodmond, after an effort to make his peace with representatives of the Sons of England Lodges of Winnipeg, found that he was still in hot water. He then conceived a brilliant way out of the difficulty by paving the road to an apology, which furnishes one of the most ludicrous chapters in his career.

A correspondent in London was instructed to wait on Mr. Samuel and ask for an interview on the charge that he (Mr. Samuel) had stated that "in Winnipeg there were 10,000 children who do not go to school." As Mr. Samuel had never made such a statement and no one had ever suggested that he had made such a statement, Mr. Samuel readily authorized the cabling of the following: "My attention has been called to the criticism in Winnipeg of myself for stating that in Winnipeg there were 10,000 children who do not go to school. I never made any such statement, nor even suggested that or any other figure."

Sir Rodmond responded immediately with his "apology" in an interview in the Telegram, in which he said:

"If Right Honorable Mr. Samuel was incorrectly reported, and I can quite believe it possible, as it is an unprecedented thing for an English statesman to meddle in the domestic affairs of any of the overseas dominions, and as the right honorable gentleman never called upon the minister of education or any of the other officers of the department, I can quite believe that such are the facts. I desire to withdraw every statement I have made in regard to Mr. Samuel and regret very much that I should have ever believed that a gentleman occupying his position could ever have made such statements regarding the number of children not attending school in Winnipeg. I apologize to the right honorable gentleman for my criticism and trust that the same publicity will be given my apology as was given my criticism."

The Macdonald Election Outrages

In the Dominion by-election in Macdonald in 1912 the subversion of justice and the arbitrary and unlawful use of the powers of the provincial police and magistrates by Sir Rodmond Roblin reached a pitch never before known in the history of Canada. Scores of men of every kind, including many of the most notorious of the heelers of the Winnipeg machine were sworn in as special provincial constables, provided with badges and handcuffs, and a brief authority with which they proceeded to terrorize the whole constituency. Dominion officers and the regular provincial officers were also forced into the work.

Emboldened by the public utterances of the premier himself, these special constables embarked on a most outrageous campaign. Respected and honorable residents were threatened right and left with arrest if they left their homes to take any part in the election campaign, and it was a common occurrence to have these pseudo policemen shake the handcuffs in the face of reputable citizens and tell them that they would be arrested and jailed if they did not go home and leave politics alone.

Premier Roblin raised the cry early in the campaign, declaring that the constituency was overrun with a "boodling gang of thugs and thieves," and in an interview in the Telegram, October 5, 1912, he said "I have instructed the provincial police to arrest these men, and they will be placed in jail at the earliest possible moment." Immediately following this declaration, four Liberal workers against whom there was not so much as a suggestion of evidence, were arrested, jailed, refused bail and kept out of the way for no other purpose than to break up the organization of the independent candidate and intimidate other workers.

THE WALKINSHAW CASE

D. H. Walkinshaw, a young Canadian, aged 26, who had come west from Ontario in September, was arrested at Rathwell, Tuesday, October 9. He was a purely voluntary worker, having taken part in the Reciprocity campaign in Ontario in 1911. No specific charge of any kind was laid against him. He was arrested by A. C. Ross, an employee of the Dominion Government attached to the Immigration Department. The warrant, issued by Paul Kane, J.P., of Rathwell, was issued on the strength of an information laid by one Charles Chadd, a man unknown in Rathwell, who disappeared mysteriously immediately after Walkinshaw's arrest. Chadd turned up in Winnipeg six months later and turned out to be an obscure private detective who had been sworn in as one of the host of so-called special provincial constables. Walkinshaw was searched and all his effects taken away from him, and then rushed into the Provincial jail in Winnipeg by the first train. Friends who attempted to communicate with him at Rathwell station were kept away in a most offensive manner by Ross. At the jail he was locked up, his clothes taken from him and the next morning, bail having been refused, he was rushed in a taxicab to the Union Station. He was taken to Portage la Prairie, where he was again locked up in the

Provincial jail there. On Wednesday afternoon he appeared before Magistrate Marshall, but on the request of F. G. Taylor, crown prosecutor, who declared he had no papers nor instructions on the case, was remanded until Saturday. Walkinshaw demanded bail, but Taylor objected, stating that he had been advised the case was too serious for bail to be allowed. It was refused by the magistrate. On Saturday another remand was asked for by the crown prosecutor who said he had received no instructions. Walkinshaw again demanded bail and this was finally arranged, but it was not until after 8 o'clock that he was released.

On the following Thursday Walkinshaw appeared before Mayor Garland, Magistrate Marshall being absent from the city. Not a tittle of evidence was offered, the crown prosecutor asking that the case be dismissed as he had no evidence to produce. Mr. Walkinshaw was represented by his solicitor, E. J. McMurray, who succeeded in getting a certificate of dismissal. At no time did Walkinshaw succeed in getting any particulars of the charge against him except the vague terms of the warrant which charged him with "unlawfully violating section 269 of the Election Act."

ARREST OF J. J. SULLIVAN

J. J. Sullivan, of Melville, Sask., an ardent advocate of wider markets, came on invitation to assist in the campaign. From the moment he reached Winnipeg he was shadowed by provincial detectives, followed to Carman and arrested there on Monday, October 7, by Provincial Constable Campbell, who was travelling under the assumed name of Bertram. He was taken to Winnipeg on the first train and arraigned before Magistrate McMicken, who, without hearing any evidence of any kind, remanded him "until the afternoon of the day of the election." These were the very words of the magistrate. Sullivan was then taken to the provincial jail and treated like a common prisoner until he refused to eat the food offered him, when other food at exorbitant prices was brought him. He was allowed to see his lawyer, H. D. Cutler, for only three minutes. He remained in jail all Tuesday and Wednesday. On Thursday he was visited by C. H. Forrester, a notorious Roblin agent, Kennedy, a partner of Forrester's, and a lawyer. They told him that if he would leave the city for home at 2.15 he would be set free. Sullivan said he could not leave until 6 o'clock, as he had business to transact in the city. At 11 o'clock he was taken in custody to Forrester's office, where he met Magistrate McMicken and a number of police officials, all of whom urged him to go home. After a visit to the Richardson committee room, he decided to go home, but when he read a paper showing what an uproar was being made over his arrest, he changed his mind and decided to "stick it out" until he was cleared. He went back to Forrester and told him he was not going home. "I'll stay and stand my trial for the charge that is laid against me. I am quite willing to go back to jail," he told Forrester. Later he refused to go at all until given a discharge.

Provincial Constable Parr was then called and Sullivan was put in his charge. They had dinner and went to the show in the evening and occupied the same room in a hotel that night. On Friday morning they

went to Forrester's office again, when Sullivan again asked for his discharge. Forrester said that they had all the power of the government, the magistrate and the courts behind them, and that they would make him sorry if he ever faced trial. Sullivan said there could be no evidence against him, but Forrester threatened him that he would be found guilty anyway, and that the only way out for him was to leave the province. After some further parley during the day Sullivan decided to go home, and left for Regina at 6 o'clock, accompanied by a provincial constable. On Friday, November 8, Sullivan returned to Winnipeg, having been advised that his name was on the docket in Magistrate McMicken's court for that day. W. H. Trueman appeared for Sullivan and was informed that the case had been withdrawn. The magistrate refused to give a certificate of dismissal and an extraordinary scene took place in court, the magistrate losing his temper and creating a disturbance. This was the direct cause for the magistrate being later removed from the bench.

W. B. SIFTON KEPT IN HOTEL

William B. Sifton, a well-known and respected resident of Minotona, Man., was arrested at St. Laurent on Friday, October 11, the day before the by-election. The poll records which he had on his person were confiscated, with the result that the opposition candidate's organization at St. Laurent was useless on election day. Sifton had formerly lived in the St. Laurent district for many years, and it was for that reason he offered to go there and organize the poll for the opposition candidate. *

When Mr. Sifton went to St. Laurent from Winnipeg on Tuesday preceding election, he was accompanied on the train by two provincial constables who hardly let him out of their sight until Friday at 2 p.m., when he was arrested. The arrest was made by Provincial Constable Jarvis and Tom Stedman, a Winnipeg boot and shoe dealer, who was sworn in as a special constable, who has always been an active Conservative worker, and who is now a member of the Provincial Liquor License Board. Mr. Sifton was brought into Winnipeg Friday night and kept in a downtown hotel. On Saturday he was taken to the provincial police court. There he met Marsh Jackson, the notorious "special agent" of the Roblin administration, who informed Mr. Sifton that he had better plead guilty to two charges of bribery. Mr. Sifton demanded indignantly to know what charges had been laid against him, and when told that there were affidavits charging him with bribery and other acts, defied proof, saying that if there were such affidavits, they were false and the men who made them were perjurers. No action was taken in the court, although Mr. Sifton was arraigned, and he was later taken to the offices of the Attorney General, when Magistrate McMicken ordered an adjournment until Monday. The Deputy Attorney General said everything would be all right, and told Mr. Sifton to go back to the court and he would telephone instructions to the magistrate. He was told by the magistrate that if he would consent to a summary trial instead of a jury trial, for which he had elected, he would be dismissed at once. Mr. Sifton consented, and asked for a certificate of dismissal. Magistrate McMicken said he would not give this until he

had conferred with other persons, and told Mr. Sifton to come back the next day. Mr. Sifton returned the next day, and for three weeks following presented himself in court and demanded that he either be granted a certificate of honorable discharge or that the case be proceeded with. To this day he has never obtained either.

"PLEAD GUILTY AND BE RELEASED"

R. J. A. Prince, a well-known young law student of St. Boniface, was arrested at Cardinal on Friday, October 11. The arrest was made by Frank Chittick on a warrant charging Prince with having paid \$10 to Paul Fries, of Notre Dame de Lourdes, to induce Fries to abstain from voting. Prince was taken to Morden jail by Constable A. C. Ross, a Dominion government employee, where he was locked up. Throughout the evening and the next day he was bullied and cajoled by Ross, the jailers and others, who urged him to plead guilty, when he would be immediately released. He was told by the jailer that he had better plead guilty, as if he did not, he would be kept in jail a long time and might get a heavy sentence. Prince refused throughout. Among those who came and tried to get him to plead guilty was Jack Kennedy, a hotel keeper of Morden and a well-known Tory heeler. At 4 o'clock in the afternoon Prince appeared before Magistrate Morden, who remanded the case until the following Thursday, at the request of Ross, the constable. Prince was represented by counsel who demanded bail, but it was refused and Prince went back to jail. Later in the evening he was summoned to sign bail papers and was released that night. On the following Thursday, Prince returned to Morden where Magistrate Morden dismissed the case, after the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Bowen, had admitted that he had no evidence whatever to offer. The magistrate declared that Prince should never have been arrested. He gave a certificate of dismissal.

FAVORED TREATMENT FOR TORY PERSONATORS

In striking contrast to the Russian treatment given these Liberal workers arrested and jailed without a tittle of evidence against them, was the treatment of two confessed personators, caught red-handed at the polls on election day, both known to be attempting to vote illegally for the Conservative candidate.

The real names of the two personators was never learned. One who gave the name of Tom Morris and gave a fictitious address in the city, was caught attempting to vote in the name of Valentine G. Quinn, who was known to be in British Columbia. His arrest was effected only after strenuous work by the Liberal scrutineers, as the government scrutineers were determined that he should be let go. Morris was caught at Poll 4 at Deer Lodge. Another man, who gave the name of Wood, and later said his name was Robert Stout, was caught attempting to vote in the name of Allan W. Craigie, who was well known to several in the polling booth, at Poll 2, St. James. Again there was trouble in having the man arrested. Both men were released on \$250 bail bonds that night, bail being granted by a Justice of the Peace who had been active all day in the campaign for the Conservative candidate. They were arraigned before Magistrate McMicken the next morning and re-

manded, their trial being set for 11 o'clock on October 16. The solicitor for the complainants was given this information at the police court.

On the day set for trial, counsel and witnesses appeared at 11 o'clock, only to be informed that the cases had been disposed of, the men having pleaded guilty, and each fined \$50. Investigation showed that the men had never appeared in court at all, but had been allowed to appear before Magistrate McMicken at 9.30, before the court opened. As a matter of fact there is nothing to show that they ever appeared personally at all. The clerk of the court stated that he had not seen the men and knew nothing of the disposition of the cases.

Premier Roblin and the Eli Sand Company

The charges made against Premier Roblin personally in the Legislature in 1909 that he had used his position and the government's influence with the Canadian Northern to his own profit as a partner in the Gunn Sand and Stone Company and the Eli Sand Company, have never been refuted, nor has the government ever allowed the investigation asked for by the Liberal opposition at three successive sessions, in 1909, 1910 and 1911.

About the year 1904, the Gunn Sand and Stone Company was organized. It comprised John Gunn, contractor, the owner of the land, Hugh Sutherland, executive agent of the Canadian Northern Ry., R. P. Roblin, prime minister of Manitoba, and E. A. James, then general manager of the C.N.R. The sand deposit was on a quarter section near Stonewall, about five miles from the Oak Point branch of the C.N.R.

After the organization of the company, Premier Roblin induced the C.N.R. to build a spur line into the pit, which the company did on the condition that the government give a guarantee of bonds to the extent of \$10,000 a mile, which was done and the spur built. It was done in the cheapest possible manner, ties and track being laid on the bare prairie on a 50-foot right of way, half the usual width, and at a cost of no more than \$5,000 a mile.

The spur was used exclusively for hauling out the sand until the pit was exhausted, after which it was used by the C.N.R. for storing empty cars out of season. No commercial traffic was ever hauled over the spur until 1908, when some farmers, without permission, commandeered two or three empty cars and loaded them with farm produce. Efforts to get the C.N.R. to haul the cars out were unavailing, but finally a train crew there on other business was induced to take them out. Photographs of the spur in 1910 showed it to be covered with snow, with long grass growing between the ties, indicating that it had not been used.

A deliberate attempt was made to conceal the fact that the bonds for this spur had been guaranteed by the Roblin government. The report of guarantees brought down in the session of 1907 by Premier Roblin, himself as Minister of Railways, purporting to contain all the guarantees up to December 31, 1906, made no mention of the Gunn sand pit spur.

FREE SAND FROM C.N.R.

After the Gunn sand pit was exhausted, Premier Roblin continued his profitable activities in the sand business as a partner in the Eli Sand Company, his associates being Hugh Sutherland and E. A. James, both Canadian Northern officials. About this time the C.N.R. were constructing under a guarantee from the Roblin government, a branch about ten miles long to a gravel pit at Bird's Hill, from which they took gravel for road ballasting. The supply at the Eli pits being unsatisfactory, and having learned that there were pockets of fine building sand in the Bird's Hill pits of no use to the railway company, Mr.

Roblin, on behalf of his company, induced the C.N.R. to allow the Eli Sand Company to have this sand for nothing. The C.N.R. gave the sand company a preferential freight rate of \$10 a box car, the regular rate for which would have been \$40. Up to the end of 1907, covering the operations of three years, the partners in the Eli Sand Company divided profits amounting to over \$90,000.

INVESTIGATION DENIED BY GOVERNMENT

These facts were formally brought to the attention of the Legislature on March 9, 1909, by T. C. Norris, leader of the Liberal opposition in a resolution demanding a select committee of enquiry. The Premier left the chamber when the matter was brought up, and the resolution was voted down on a straight party division. On the following day Premier Roblin made the statement that he had been one of those interested in the handling of sand from Bird's Hill to Winnipeg until the end of the year 1907, but that he had then withdrawn from the company.

Just how much reliance can be placed in this statement is shown by several interesting and conclusive documents. On June 8, 1908, five months after the date of Mr. Roblin's alleged retirement from the Eli Sand Company, Hugh Sutherland indited a letter to the Premier enclosing a statement of the affairs of the company up to May 30, 1908. On October 19, 1908, nine months after Mr. Roblin had "retired," Mr. Sutherland wrote again enclosing a balance sheet up to September 30, 1908. On November 14, 1908, Mr. Sutherland wrote to Mr. Roblin, enclosing a financial statement of the Eli Sand Company up to October 31. On January 2, 1909, came a still more remarkable letter from Mr. Sutherland. It enclosed a cheque for \$1,000 from the Eli Sand Company to Mr. Roblin, also a "rough statement" in the handwriting of Mr. Sutherland up to December 31, 1908.

This statement shows conclusively that notwithstanding his statement that he had retired from the Eli Sand Company at the end of 1907, his share in the profits of that company for the year 1908 amounted on one-half of the sum of \$13,342.31, and that \$3,000 of that profit had actually been paid to Mr. Roblin prior to his statement in the Legislature on March 10, 1909.

On March 13, 1910, T. C. Norris again brought the matter to the attention of the house in a resolution demanding that the whole affair be investigated by a committee of judges. D. A. Ross, M.P.P., reiterated the charges and offered to resign his seat if he could not prove them. On this occasion, Mr. Roblin was absent, but Hon. Robert Rogers, acting premier, called on the Conservative majority to reject the motion, which was done, again on a straight party vote. Later on in the session Mr. Norris suggested that the house should not prorogue but should adjourn for a sufficient period to permit Mr. Roblin to return to make further explanation of these charges. This proposition was not entertained, and the session hurriedly closed.

In the session of 1911, on March 6, Mr. Norris returned to the subject and again asked for some action toward an investigation, but the suggestion was ignored.

Telephones

The announcement by the Roblin Government of its intention to provide a public-owned system of telephones was made by Mr. Roblin in a speech at Norwood on November 23, 1905. The reasons which induced the government to take this position were set forth by the Premier in the following terms:

"The telephone is, and must be, necessarily, a monopoly, and yet is one of the most desirable and necessary facilities for the dispatch of business, and for the convenience and pleasure of the people, therefore, the price of telephones should be made so low that laboring men and artisans can have the convenience and advantage of the telephone as well as the merchant, the professional man, and the gentleman of wealth and leisure; and it is our intention to recommend to Parliament a proposition of this kind with a view of giving a telephone system to all classes at cost plus the amount for maintenance, operation and interest."

Mr. Roblin went on to indicate various ways by which a government system of telephones could be established. One course open, he said, was to purchase the Bell Telephone System, then in existence in the province. But he went on to declare that if this was done it would be purchased at a price that would be fair and reasonable, but not one, however, based on the capitalization of the company at the present time.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

At the 1906 session of the legislature a special telephone committee was appointed at the instance of the government. This committee, after holding an enquiry in Winnipeg and making a tour of inspection of independent telephone systems in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Janesville, Wis., and Grand Rapids, Mich., made a report through its Chairman, Hon. C. H. Campbell, on February 27. The committee found that in these cities the independent companies were operating successfully after cutting the Bell rates in two. The committee outlined a telephone policy in a series of resolutions, the first two of which read as follows:

1. Resolved that the telephone is such a public utility that it should be owned and operated as a government and municipal undertaking in order that it may serve the people as a whole and give to every person an opportunity of enjoying its advantages at cost.
2. Resolved that the present rates charged for telephone service are exorbitant, and that a considerable reduction could easily be made, especially if the service were to be furnished at cost to the subscriber."

The resolutions advised that the government build the long distance lines, the local systems being supplied by the municipalities, power being taken by the government to build local systems in Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie if these municipalities did not care to assume the task.

THE GOVERNMENT'S PROMISES

On March 1, 1906, Hon. Colin H. Campbell, moved in the legislature the second reading of the two telephone bills giving effect to the government's telephone policy. Speaking to the motion, Mr. Campbell

made a severe attack upon the charges of the Bell system as extortionate and made specific promises of substantial reductions. Speaking on the Bell Telephone Company's rates he said:

"They advanced a very fallacious theory. They said that the greater the number of phones in use the greater the cost per phone, and therefore as they had only selfish capital to serve they would act in the interests of capital."

The Attorney-General further said:

"I do not wish to detain the House by giving the statistics as to excessive charges. I have before me a statement of the charges of nearly every country operating in Europe. All these countries operating long-distance lines give the service at one-half the cost of the Bell Company in the United States and Canada. The charges in the United States and Canada are double the British rates and four times as much as the German. There would appear to be no satisfactory reason for this, as it is well known that the cost of the English trunk lines is very much greater than of those upon this continent for the following among other reasons:

1. Much heavier copper wire is used, the lines weighing 800 lbs. to the mile as against 200 lbs.
2. Poles have to be imported and creosoted, whereas here native cedar is used.
3. Porcelain insulators and iron bolts are used in England; glass insulators and wooden pins here.

"I am satisfied that the present rates in Canada could be cut in two and still leave a very satisfactory profit on the working.

"Whatever may be said of the cheapness of labor in those countries as against the labor of this country, that is, in my judgment, more than offset by the extra cost that has to be paid by the old country and continental countries for the construction of their systems.

"Now, sir, I believe from these figures and from the experience of other governments and of municipalities I am justified in making the statement that a better, more efficient and more satisfactory service could be given than is now given at less than one-half the rates that are now charged."

As to telephones in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Campbell said:

"We could put in in this city, I believe, from the figures that the committee ascertained, 10,000 phones at a cost not exceeding \$1,250,000 if the experience of Grand Rapids is maintained, and I believe other places have had similar experience or better experience. The City of Winnipeg could enjoy a much better service than they now enjoy at one-half the cost that it is now incumbent upon them to pay. In so far as the country is concerned the cost of construction, generally speaking, is about \$45, \$50 or \$55, which would be an outside price."

RATES TO BE CUT IN TWO

During the summer and autumn of 1906 the Roblin Government carried on an active campaign in preparation for the municipal election of December, 1906, when the ratepayers of each municipality were called upon to decide whether or not they should embark on the telephone business. Its chief argument, repeated over and over again, was that a public-owned telephone service would give better service for a smaller price.

In a pamphlet issued by the government, and widely circulated in November and December, 1906, there was a statement by Mr. Frances Dagger, who had been engaged by the government to take charge of the work of inaugurating the telephone system, that a rural telephone could be given for \$1.00 per month. (See pamphlet "The Manitoba Government and Public Ownership of Telephones." — Printed by Jas. Hooper, King's Printer for Manitoba.)

Hon. Colin H. Campbell, in an interview published in the Telegram, December 10, 1906: "In the country the reduction will be one-half of the existing rates."

Hon. R. P. Roblin, as quoted in the Winnipeg Telegram, December 11, 1906: "It is simply a matter of those who use telephones paying for them, and also, only to pay half what the Bell people now charge."

Three or four days later, Mr. Roblin, in an interview published in the Telegram, dealing with long distance charges, said: "We will more than cut the Bell figures in two."

Mr. Roblin, speaking in Neepawa, December 20 (as quoted in the Winnipeg Telegram of December 21), said that, one year from that time, they would be able to speak over a government-owned long distance line from Neepawa to Winnipeg at "less than half what is charged by the Bell Telephone Company at the present time."

THE LIBERAL POSITION

The Liberal party, in the conventions held in March, 1906, declared in favor of the public ownership of all public utilities, including telephones. It declined, however, to accept the government's scheme, holding that it did not meet the requirements; and declared in favor of the government assuming the entire responsibility of establishing a province-wide telephone system.

The impracticability of the government's policy was indicated when, in December, 1906, 68 municipalities, out of a total of 128, declined to co-operate with the government.

During the year 1907 the government issued provincial debentures to the extent of one million dollars, and with this money made a start with its telephone programme by beginning the construction of a system in the City of Winnipeg.

The Roblin government before the close of 1907 recognized that its hybrid telephone scheme would not work and adopted the Liberal policy which called for a province-wide telephone system, owned and operated by the government. Nothing has since been heard of co-operation between the government and the municipalities in the matter of telephone service.

PURCHASE OF THE BELL SYSTEM

The first step in the establishment of a telephone system was the purchase on December 31, 1907, of the whole telephone equipment in the province owned by the Bell Telephone Company. The purchase was put through within two days of the meeting of the legislature. This transaction was not submitted to the representatives of the people for

ratiification; and has never received the approval of the legislature. This action is without precedent in modern constitutional history.

This purchase was made on a six days' valuation made by an engineer in the employment of the government, O. French, whose services were afterwards dispensed with.

Detailed figures were published by the government in their telephone campaign to show how cheaply the most up-to-date system could be constructed to compete with the Bell's "out-of-date" system. The Telegram, on November 21, 1906, published the detailed figures, as compiled by the government experts, for various classes of construction showing that one mile of wire and one telephone complete could be installed complete for from \$62.85 for the lowest, to \$97.95 for the best class of construction, labor included.

Yet with these figures before them the government purchased the "out-of-date" Bell plant for \$232.50 per telephone.

PAID OVER A MILLION TOO MUCH

Immediately after this sale the stock of the Bell Telephone Company rose from 120 to 130 per share on the Montreal market, which meant an increase of \$1,200,000 to the shareholders. This was the money market's judgment of the worth of the bargain made by the Bell Company.

The annual report of the Bell Telephone Company for December 31, 1907, showed that the company had in Canada 111,118 telephones, 49,784 miles of wire and 9,540 miles of long distance poles. The balance sheet valued the whole of the company's property at \$16,385,680. Manitoba purchased a few days after the date of this balance sheet 14,195 telephones or less than 13 per cent of the whole; 4,998 miles of wire or 10.04 per cent of the whole; and 1,192 miles of long distance poles or 12.48 per cent of the whole, but the Manitoba Government paid the Bell Company a price equal to 20.74 per cent of the whole valuation of the company's plant in Canada.

Instead of getting a property worth \$3,400,000, the price paid, the Province got a property worth only \$2,130,188 according to the figures of the balance sheet of the company, dated ten days before the purchase. The difference of \$1,269,862 is what the government overpaid the Bell by their last balance sheet.

Mr. Sise in his evidence said that the cost of their investment in Canada per telephone amounted to \$159, that figure including real estate, patents, long distance lines, etc. Yet the Manitoba Government paid \$232 per phone or \$73 per phone over the sworn figures of President Sise. Multiply 14,195 phones purchased by \$73 each and the result shows that the price was \$1,036,235 more than the system was worth.

FICTITIOUS TELEPHONE SURPLUSES

The telephone system, after being acquired by the government, was placed in charge of a Telephone Commission made up of three officials of the Bell Telephone Company—F. C. Paterson, W. H. Hayes and H. J. Horan. During the years 1908, 1909 and 1910 the claim was constantly made by the government that the system was being operated

at a profit to the province. Annual statements were submitted showing apparent surpluses, and these surpluses were abstracted from the telephone funds and taken over by the province as part of its regular revenue. In the year 1908 the amount thus transferred from the telephone account to the general revenue of the province amounted to \$168,915, in 1909 to \$104,303, and in 1910 to \$110,028, making an amount for the three years appropriated to consolidated revenue of \$383,248.

These annual statements showing apparent profits were subjected year by year to criticism by Liberal opposition in the Legislature, who declared that the surplus was fictitious, and that in reality the system was being operated at a loss. It was pointed out that the allowance being made for maintenance was only 2½ per cent of the capital stock, whereas all experts agreed that the allowance for maintenance should never fall below 5 per cent, while some telephone companies, including the Bell, fixed the proper amount at 10 per cent. It was therefore evident, the opposition said, that the telephone system was either being allowed to deteriorate, or at least half of the maintenance charges were being paid out of capital. They further pointed out that there was no allowance made for a sinking fund to repay the bonds upon maturity, nor were there any sums set apart for a contingent fund such as is carried in the accounts of the Bell Telephone Company.

The Liberal opposition declared that in reality the system was being operated year after year at a considerable annual loss. They protested against the action of the government in deflecting telephone moneys into the general treasury, and in the Legislature in 1910 submitted a resolution declaring that these amounts should be returned to the Telephone Commission to be held both as a reserve or applied towards the reduction of rates in keeping with the promises made by the government when the policy was inaugurated.

The government met this criticism by a general declaration that the allowance for maintenance was ample; that the system was being kept in first-class condition; that the surpluses shown in the accounts were real surpluses; and that the government was entitled to take over these surpluses and apply them to the general expenses of the province.

While the government failed to make the cut in rates which had been promised, it made some slight reductions in 1909. The farmers' telephones were reduced from \$30 to \$25, and from \$24 to \$20; while in Winnipeg the residence rate was cut from \$30 to \$25. This was a reduction, for a portion only of the telephone users, of 1/6 instead of a reduction of ½ which the government had pledged itself to give.

INCREASED LONG DISTANCE CHARGES

As for the promised reductions in long distance charges, no attempt was made to carry them out. The old Bell rates remained, and with respect to a great many offices, the time for a message was reduced from three minutes to two. In May, 1911, the lower night rates were wiped out, the day rate being applied to the whole 24 hours. The three-minute limit for conversation which still applied to a considerable number of offices in Manitoba was abolished and a uniform rate made, which was based on a two-minute conversation, with an excess charge,

which amounted, in most cases, to half the rate of the original charge for each additional minute. Thus a contrast between the long distance rates as they are now and as they were when the government took over the system shows a reduction of 1/3 in the time allowed for conversation, and an increase of approximately 1/3 in the rates for night messages.

LARGE INCREASES ORDERED BY COMMISSION

In his budget speech of February 28, 1911, Hon. Hugh Armstrong retold the story of the great financial success of the telephone system and predicted a surplus of \$300,000 for the current year.

On December 13, 1911, ten months later, Chairman Paterson, of the Telephone Commission, announced that as the system was being run at a heavy loss a new schedule of rates, which would increase the revenue, had been prepared to become effective April 1, 1912.

In Winnipeg the new rates were to be \$48 a year for residence phones, unlimited service, or, for "measured service" a rate which would work out to \$47.20 a year, on the basis of five calls a day, while for business 'phones there was to be no unlimited service, but only "measured service" at the rate of \$48 a year for 100 calls a month, all calls above that number to be 2 cents each. A business man using his telephone twenty times a day for the 305 business days of the year would thus pay \$156 a year.

Outside Winnipeg the new rates were to run from \$25 for a business phone, \$15 a residence phone and \$20 a rural phone, for exchanges with under 100 subscribers, with day service only, up to \$45 a business phone, \$27 a residence phone and \$36 a rural phone, for exchanges with from 1,000 to 5,000 subscribers, with continuous service.

PUBLIC OPPOSITION TO NEW SCHEDULE

The new rates were greeted with cries of rage from all parts of the Province. In Winnipeg, hundreds of citizens, many of them strong Conservatives, went on record in the public press as being absolutely opposed to them. The protests from Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Deloraine, Carman, Souris, Minnedosa, Lariviere, Napinka, Rapid City, Manitou, Treherne, Crystal City, Cartwright, Virden, Boissevain, Melita and other points throughout the Province were no less vigorous. At Boissevain a meeting of two hundred farmers of the municipality of Morton passed a strong resolution of indignant protest. The same thing was done at a meeting of the ratepayers of Kildonan.

But day after day, despite the expressions of protest and indignation, the Winnipeg Telegram, the government's newspaper organ, continued to argue that the increased rates were justifiable and that, after they were put into operation, the objections to them would die down. "The people of Winnipeg and Manitoba," it said on December 16, "are fair-minded. They will not condemn the work of the commission in advance of its actual operation," thus admitting that it was the intention of the government to put the rates into effect. In the same issue the Telegram declared that the "new phone rates are no hardship for the average citizen." On December 18, the Telegram said that "snap judgment in criticism of the new rates will give way to commendation when the advantages of the new system are understood and

appreciated." On December 20, the Telegram was quite satisfied that the people "will accept the judgment of the commission which is responsible to the government."

The course followed by the government's newspaper made it quite plain that the government was behind the new rates, and intended to enforce them. This, indeed, was subsequently admitted by Hon. Hugh Armstrong, who said in the budget speech on March 12, 1912: "The commission assured us that the only means of meeting that apparent deficit showing up for the year 1911 was by raising the rates. The government with some hesitation and some reluctance DID AGREE TO THIS RAISING of the rates, and then the matter became public history."

Such however was the strength of the public protest that the government was forced to bow before it. Hon. Colin H. Campbell, in an address to the North Winnipeg Conservative Association, on December 28, said that the government was not wedded to the new rates and would welcome representations from telephone users.

On January 4, 1912, Mr. Roblin made an address to the Young Conservatives in the Maw Block, in which he announced that the telephones would come under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission. In marked contrast with speeches in previous years, when he claimed to know all about the telephones, he announced that he knew nothing about them. He described the telephone as "a scientific involved and most difficult adjunct or utility to our twentieth century civilization. In its operation it produces results that are simply remarkable." He admitted that having confidence in the loyalty, honesty and ability of the telephone commission, the government had given its assent to the new rates. Whether they were fair or proper, only experience, Mr. Roblin said, could demonstrate.

AN INVESTIGATION FORCED

Notwithstanding this intimation that the rates must go into effect and be submitted to the test of experience, the government, under the continued pressure of public indignation, appointed on January 16, 1912, a special commission to inquire into the telephone situation in the Province. Judge Locke was named chairman of the commission, and associated with him were R. L. Barry, of Minneapolis, and George R. Crowe, of Winnipeg. This commission met on February 2nd, and began an investigation which lasted for some weeks, the commission touring the Province to hear the evidence.

The telephone situation was much discussed at the 1912 session of the Legislature. Members of the Liberal opposition made statements showing that the telephone system had been administered on political lines, the patronage in every part of the Province having been controlled by the party in the interests of its own supporters. Instances of extravagant and wasteful work were also cited.

On March 12, the Provincial Treasurer admitted a deficit for the year on the telephone business of \$43,040 and an overdraft of \$159,422, making a total deficit of \$202,462.

On March 14, T. H. Johnson moved that a special committee of the Legislature be appointed to investigate the telephone situation in the

Province, and to go into all the circumstances attendant upon the inauguration and establishment of the system. Mr. Johnson and the Liberal opposition held that the commission appointed by the government did not possess sufficient powers to make the enquiry as complete as it should be. The government refused to accept this resolution, adopting by a party vote an amendment, declaring that no further action should be taken pending the report of the Royal Commission then taking evidence.

THE COMMISSION'S FINDING

The new rates did not go into effect on April 1, the government ordering their postponement pending the finding of the commission. This finding was made public in June, 1912. It found that in the administration in the telephone system there had been inefficiency, wastefulness and petty graft. The organization was found to be defective and the system of checking accounts inadequate. The commission found that there was abundant evidence to prove the "general prevalence" of the "pernicious custom" of issuing blank vouchers to telephone employees engaged in construction work throughout the country.

The commission stated that in some instances "it was shown that the amounts written in the vouchers after signature were greater than the amount actually paid." The commission found that supplies had been purchased very largely in excess of requirements, and that excess prices had been paid for these supplies owing to the lack of competition. On January 1, 1912, the value of the supplies on hand was \$609,359, "at least twice as much as there should have been" in the opinion of the commission. These supplies included 162,763 poles, "thus swelling this account beyond all bounds." The commission stated that "large quantities of materials had been purchased without observing the formality of asking for tenders." The commission pointed out that of a total of \$797,136 of a certain class of material bought during the year 1911, \$725,916 was paid to two concerns said to be controlled by the Bell Company. Much of this, the commission stated, was the result of private treaty without other dealers being given an opportunity of tendering. On the question of rates, the commission found that circumstances did not justify the schedule of rates proposed by the telephone commissioners.

NEW COMMISSION—NEW RATES

On July 1, 1912, the Telephone Commissioners resigned, and, after an interval, the telephone system was placed in charge of Geo. A. Watson, commissioner, with H. E. Brockwell as engineer. The schedule of rates, drafted by the former telephone commission, was abandoned and new rates, approved by the Public Utilities Commissioner, became effective August 1, 1912. The rates in Winnipeg were increased from \$25 to \$30 for residence phones and from \$50 to \$60 for business phones. The new rates for outside points showed a corresponding increase. For Brandon, the new rates were: Business, \$40, an increase of \$5; residence, \$25, an increase of \$5; rural, \$25, unchanged. For Portage la Prairie the former rates were continued: Business, \$35; residence, \$20; rural, \$25.

Business rates in smaller towns went up from \$20 to \$22, \$24 or \$25; residence rates from \$15 to \$18 and \$20. Rates in pay stations only were unchanged. The service at many country points was, however, greatly restricted, the size of the exchanges being cut down, so that the flat subscription rate covered but a small area.

SIR RODMOND ROBLIN PLEADS IGNORANCE

Sir Rodmond Roblin, in a speech in the legislature, on April 3, 1912, made a general confession of ignorance of the telephone business. He said:

"I had in my innocence, not understanding the matter thoroughly, not being an expert, said, because I was told so, by an expert who was here, that an increase in telephones would not increase the cost of operation. But what does this report state? That the telephone business is unique in that the larger the system the larger becomes the charges to the subscribers. Let us consider that in the light of the growth of the telephone system in the province since the government took it over."

"It is unfortunate that wrong impressions have been created in the minds of the public since the provincial government took over the telephones by the publication of untrue and erroneous statements. We know it and my honorable friends know it, and the statements were either made wilfully or without knowledge. The report refers to this and says it is to be regretted. These gentlemen say that the old rates should have been maintained; that the reduction of the rates was a mistake and we admit it. We have no disposition to conceal any mistakes we have made. They were made in ignorance; we had not the technical knowledge as to the operation of the system. We thought that as we added to the subscribers the rates would be reduced, but we find that is not the case."

PRESENT STATUS OF TELEPHONES

A report of the operation of the telephone system for the twelve months ending November 30, 1913, was made by H. A. Robson, the Public Utilities Commissioner, in January, 1914. This showed a net surplus for the twelve months amounting to \$30,264.64, of which \$26,690.74 goes to Depreciation Account, leaving \$3,573.90 to go into the Provincial treasury. The statement shows the Province's total investment in the telephone system as \$10,156,025.96. That is to say, for the twelve months in question there is (leaving out of account the fact that there is no provision for a sinking fund for the redemption of the bonds) a showing of one-third of one per cent profit on the investment of the money of the people of Manitoba in this business, as the result of the heavy increases in rates, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The summarized statement of operations for the year was as follows:

Revenue—	
Exchange revenue	\$ 1,355,891.91
Toll revenue	335,238.33
Sundry net earnings	16,219.50
Total	\$ 1,707,149.74

Expenses—

Operating	597,472.44
Maintenance	207,842.45
Carried to replacement (depreciation)	
trust account	373,431.00
Taxes	1,104.01
Total	\$ 1,260,800.89
Net earnings	437,230.84
Interest charges for year	400,075.20
Surplus	30,261.64
Surplus added to replacement — trust account	26,090.74
Balance due Treasurer	3,573.90

GENERAL BALANCE SHEET

Assets

Plant	\$ 9,624,878.19
Office furniture and fixtures	25,167.47
Supplies, tools and vehicles	395,044.33
Cash and deposits	181,962.76
Provincial treasury trust account	326,690.74
Accounts receivable	107,853.52
Prepaid expenses	5,232.40
Total	\$10,666,829.50

Liabilities

Government investment	\$10,156,025.96
Accounts payable	83,230.53
Unearned revenue	79,379.92
Replacement reserves (depreciation)	343,793.98
Provincial treasury current account	4,393.11
Total	\$10,666,829.50

This was the first honest statement of the telephone business of the province ever made; and the credit for this is due to the Public Utilities Commissioner who insisted upon the laying aside of a certain sum, in accordance with a schedule of percentages arranged by him to apply to the different portions of the whole plant and equipment, to make provision for depreciation. This is the first annual statement in which adequate provision is thus made for depreciation.

Thus the people of Manitoba, after investing over ten million dollars in the telephone business, are not getting as promised a better service at half the prices charged by the Bell. The prices have been increased very considerably.

The inability of the government to keep its pledges as to reductions in telephone charges is the result chiefly of over-capitalization, due to an over-payment of more than a million dollars to the Bell Telephone Company, wasteful construction methods and inefficient administration, the direct consequence of persistent manipulation of the system in the interest of the Roblin Government machine.

Elevators

The Roblin government's attempt to establish a government system of elevators for the Province of Manitoba resulted in a complete fiasco involving the province in heavy loss and imperilling an investment of \$1,100,000 of the people's money.

The government went into this enterprise in a spirit of panic born of their defeat in the Birtle by-election in November, 1900, in which the question of government elevators was an issue. Up to that time the Roblin government had taken the ground that there were constitutional difficulties in the way of the province establishing such a system of elevators, but after the defeat in Birtle it speedily changed its mind, and in December, 1909, George R. Coldwell appeared before the Grain Growers in convention in Brandon and declared that the government was prepared to accept the principle of publicly owned elevators. The Grain Growers were asked by Mr. Coldwell to give the government their help and suggestions in putting the legislation which would be necessary in the best possible shape.

The government, however, in dealing, in the session of 1910, with this matter of government elevators, declined the help of the Grain Growers which it had invited at the Brandon meeting. It refused to accept a bill establishing such a system of elevators prepared by the Grain Growers' Association, and it also declined to accept the recommendations of the Grain Growers as to the parties best qualified to serve upon the Elevator Commission. The Liberal opposition urged the government to appoint a non-partisan commission responsible directly to the legislature and removable only by this body. This the government refused to accept.

After securing power to go into the elevator enterprise the government placed the business in charge of a commission made up of D. W. McCuaig, chairman, F. McLennan and W. C. Graham. The commission was organized in July, 1910, immediately after the provincial elections. The government ceased to operate the elevators on August 31, 1912. In the first year's operation a loss of \$84,145 was incurred. In the second year the loss was \$40,000. Sir Rodmond Roblin, speaking in the Legislature in April, 1912, admitted that the enterprise had been a complete failure. He said the government had been induced to go into the enterprise by false representations from the Grain Growers who had given promises of business support which they had made no attempt to fulfill. In the course of his speech Sir Rodmond said: "I have since learned that I was mistaken, and here again I am willing to admit that I was wrong. I took the voice of the demagogue for the voice of the public, and consequently I made a mistake. I believed at the time that they did represent the farmers. The result has shown that the farmers didn't want government elevators in this province. The farmers as a whole never wanted them. Experience has shown that to be a fact for the reason that they don't patronize them."

GRAIN GROWERS HOLD GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE

To this charge that the Grain Growers were responsible for the collapse of the enterprise, the Grain Growers' Guide made a hot reply on April 10, 1912, in the course of which it said:

"The government has not made an honest endeavor to make the elevator system a success, and has prevented the commissioners from exercising fundamental business principles to ensure success. Why? There has been no criticism of the commissioners, but they have been handicapped by the government. Why? It is easy to berate the Grain Growers, but the Grain Growers have had absolutely no voice in the operation of the system. If the legislation prepared by the Grain Growers had been accepted, as well as their suggestions as regards operation, and then resulted in failure there would most decidedly have been blame attachable to the Grain Growers. But when every important suggestion made by them was ignored it is hard to see how the blame can rest upon the Grain Growers. By its arbitrary action the government has made the public elevators a failure."

IRREGULARITIES IN PURCHASE

An examination of the causes of the lamentable failure of this attempt to administer publicly owned elevators shows that it was due to incompetence, mismanagement and the subordination of the enterprise to the political requirements of the government. In the purchasing of elevators there were serious irregularities. At the outset the commission purchased elevators from the existing companies by negotiation. Fifteen elevators were thus purchased at a rate averaging 12.24 cents per bushel capacity. The government then intervened and appointed a special officer to secure further elevators by the process of arbitration. By these means one hundred and fifty elevators were purchased at an average cost of over 22 cents per bushel capacity. There were further marked differences in the rate of payment for elevators purchased from the different elevator companies. Thus the government bought 19 elevators from the Dominion Elevator Co. at an average of 23.42 cents per bushel capacity; 24 elevators from the Winnipeg Elevator Co. at an average of 18.13 cents per bushel capacity; 24 from the Northern, average of 20.15 cents per bushel capacity; 18 from the Canadian, average of 19.60 cents per bushel capacity; 6 from the Western, average 19.01 cents per bushel capacity; 5 from the International, average 20.21 cents per bushel capacity; while from the various farmers' companies 18 elevators were bought at the very low rate of 12.76 cents per bushel capacity. The Dominion Elevator Co., which received favored treatment in the matter of price, is the elevator company in which Sir Rodmond Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba, was formerly president, and in which he is still thought to be largely interested.

In addition to the elevators purchased, the commission built ten elevators at a cost of \$110,000, while in the purchase of elevators they paid out \$852,370. Other expenses brought the total outlay up to the end of 1911 to \$1,001,342. An extraordinary feature of the purchase of these elevators was that the government in some cases purchased several elevators at the same point, although, as experience proved, there was only business for one. Thus the government bought two elevators at Rathwell, three at Reston, four at Binscarth, two at Altamont, two at Treherne, three at Crystal City, three at Elva, two at Hartney, four at Snowflake, four at Ninga, two at Miami, three at Griswold.

THE GRISWOLD FIASCO

The business consequences of buying elevators that were not needed and failing at the same time to make provision for the purchase of grain in small lots were set forth in the Legislature on April 3, 1912, by T. C. Norris, the Liberal leader, who illustrated his remarks by the following references to what had taken place in his home town:

"In Griswold, Mr Norris said, the government had purchased for \$4,000 the oldest elevator in the town. About two weeks afterward two more Griswold elevators had been purchased by the government. Whoever authorized the second purchase had made a mistake. It had not been good business, and it had been entirely uncalled for. In both those newer elevators the key had been turned immediately, and no more wheat had gone into them. There had been a fair crop around Griswold in 1910, but the government had used only the oldest, cheapest and first bought elevator. Last summer the government had opened the newest of the three Griswold elevators and had moved the oldest one to Manson at an expense of \$9,000. Thus some \$13,000 had been spent on an elevator which had originally cost not more than \$3,500. To date the government had paid from \$15,000 to \$16,000 for elevators in Griswold, and from those elevators, three in number, there had been shipped up to the end of August last year 23,000 bushels of wheat, bringing in to the government a revenue of \$432.07.

"Purchase of elevators, continued Mr. Norris, was not the worst point in the government's elevator scheme. The worst point was that no arrangements had been made for placing buyers at government elevator points. Since the government took over the Griswold elevators there had been no competition there. The government had destroyed competition. No wheat buyers were in evidence there. The Lake of the Woods and the Ogilvie people both had good elevator operators at Griswold, and only one price was offered for wheat. During the summer wheat was always being marketed along the main line, but at Griswold there was now no market owing to the fact that the milling elevators were not kept open. The government elevators could not take in the tail end of the crop because they could not ship in less than carload lots. The consequence was that the farmers of the Griswold district had to haul their grain to Oak Lake and Alexander, where there were no government elevators, but where there was a market all the year round."

PARTISAN MANAGEMENT OF ELEVATORS

The partisan manipulation of the elevator system was notorious. The Winnipeg Tribune in its issue of May 19, 1912, discussing the reasons for the failure of the elevator system, said:

"Another cause of failure was the fact that politics entered into the appointment of operators in the elevators. At one point last season the commission appointed a man to work the elevator and handed him the key to put it into proper shape to handle the grain. The member for the district was displeased with the appointment, came down to the city and instructions were forthwith issued that the man should hand over the key to another individual. The farmers were incensed at this interference, and the result was that the elevator only secured two cars of grain.

"At another point an operator entered into an agreement with another party to handle wheat on his private account. The

commission got word of this and discharged him. He was an official of one of the Conservative associations, attended a political banquet, was notorious as a party man, and in a few days was restored to his former position.

"It is alleged at another point that the commission found that an operator was not attending properly to public business, and discharged him. Political influence got to work and in a few days he was back in his position.

"At another point the operator disputed the accuracy of some grain figures quoted by a prominent anti-reciprocity stumper, and expressed his opinion to some party men in touch with the stumper. The man was forthwith relieved of his position. Farmers petitioned in vain to have him restored. Here the dissatisfaction of the farmers was shown in the elevator returns."

ELEVATOR POLICY ADOPTED IN PANIC

The Toronto World, a Conservative paper friendly to Mr. Roblin, commenting in its issue of June 12, 1912, upon the collapse of the elevator system in Manitoba, used this language:

"It is well known that Mr. Roblin adopted the policy in a panic on the eve of a general election with no desire for any success beyond the party success which its adoption promised. In his recent speech quoted by The News he declared in effect that he had yielded 'to the voice of the demagogue', and The Winnipeg Free Press, although an unfriendly critic, is not without justification in saying that 'Politics, extravagance and gross misconduct marked every step of the sad and sorry career' of the government in its dealings with the acquisition and operation of the elevator system. Mr. Roblin, having carried an election by advocating public elevators, and then having done all in his power to destroy their usefulness, now cynically advises Mr. Borden to violate the pledges he made, during his election campaign, respecting government-owned elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and on the strength of which he doubtless carried a number of seats in Manitoba."

The government, having been forced by these heavy losses out of the elevator business, leased their elevators to the Grain Growers Co. for a period of two years. The capital outlay on the whole system in August, 1912, stood at \$1,100,000, and the government leased the elevators on the basis of 6 per cent rental on the capital cost, or \$66,000 a year. Out of the amount thus received the government undertook to keep the buildings insured and to pay for their upkeep, etc. Under this new arrangement the government had a surplus, as shown by a report submitted to the Legislature for the year ending November 30, 1913, of \$329.84, that being the difference between the rental received from the Grain Growers Grain Co. and the outlay, consisting of interest charges and maintenance and operating expenses.

The future of the elevator system is at the present time (April, 1914) in grave doubt. The government in the hope, it is understood, of securing a more favorable arrangement has given the Grain Growers Grain Co. notice that upon the completion of its two years' term on September 1, 1914, the lease is to be terminated and the Grain Growers Grain Co. by a formal resolution of its directors, has notified the government that on that date it will not seek a renewal of the lease, but will turn the elevators back upon the government. The government will thus have on its hands a white elephant. Meanwhile, the property represented by the capital invested in the elevators, now amounting to \$1,100,000, is steadily deteriorating and threatens to become a total loss.

Progressive Agriculture and Farm Credits

A resolution outlining a progressive agricultural policy in these terms was adopted by the Liberal convention of March, 1914:

"Recognizing the intimate relation that exists between the prosperity of the farming community and the well-being of the whole community, and deplored the failure of the government to deal adequately with the economic necessities of the province, the Liberal party pledges itself, if returned to power:

"To develop and give effect to a progressive agricultural policy, embodying among others these features:

"The extension of agricultural education by more practical demonstration farms and by direct instruction, thus taking the agricultural college to the farmer.

"The encouragement by advice, support and necessary financial assistance of co-operative movements among farmers for the buying of supplies, the marketing of products and the securing of necessary funds for farming purposes upon more advantageous terms.

"To establish at once a public abattoir."

This resolution was submitted to the convention by J. D. McGregor, of Brandon. Speaking in support of it, Mr. McGregor said that the establishment of a public abattoir in the City of Winnipeg was one of the most important needs of the Province of Manitoba. It would not only have the effect of enhancing the price to the producer, but of lessening it to the consumer, as it would break into the profits of the packer.

Another matter that called for action was the financing of the farmer. At the present time the farmer was not properly financed by the system of banking that prevailed. Some re-arrangement was necessary, and that re-arrangement could only come through the government supplementing the present loan conditions. This should be done at once. They needed a system that would give the farmer a sufficient supply of credit all the year round. The profit of farming was so small that it was becoming difficult for the farmer to make a living under the existing conditions, and they were going back instead of forward. They heard much in these days about mixed farming, and the farmers had received so much advice on the question that to speak to a farmer about mixed farming was to set him on fire.

Heretofore, conditions had not been such that a farmer could make a sufficient profit. Prices were good now, and to keep them a livestock commissioner should be appointed with enough assistants to handle the matter properly and to give assistance to the farmer in marketing his stock. Mr. McGregor concluded by asserting that the question of giving agriculture all proper aid was the first and most important of all questions in Manitoba.

POSSIBILITIES OF DEVELOPMENT

The great possibilities of diversified farming in Western Canada if, by a progressive agriculture policy, inaugurated by the provincial

government, this is rendered possible through an improvement in the facilities of exchange between producer and consumer, a betterment of conditions under which the farmers secure credit, and the encouragement of better farming methods, are indicated in some measure by the figures showing the imports into Western Canada of food products during the 12 months ending March 1st, 1913. The district affected by the figures is the whole of Western Canada—covering the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. These are the figures of importations:

Meat and Packinghouse Products:

From Eastern Canada	12,760,000 lbs.
From United States	4,442,000 lbs.
Total	17,208,000 lbs.
Beef (listed as such):	
From Eastern Canada	800,000 lbs.
From United States via Gretna	6,652,740 lbs.
From United States via Vancouver	3,852,000 lbs.
Total	11,304,040 lbs.
Veal:	
American and New Zealand (through Vancouver)	13,088,000 lbs.
Mutton:	
From United States via Emerson	108,060 lbs.
From New Zealand	3,030,000 lbs.
Total	3,144,060 lbs.
Poultry:	
From Eastern Canada	960,000 lbs.
From United States via Emerson, Gretna and Portal	878,710 lbs.
Total	1,838,710 lbs.
Butter:	
From Eastern Canada	4,638,000 lbs.
From United States via Portal	660,000 lbs.
From United States via B. C. Points	820,000 lbs.
From New Zealand	18,500,000 lbs.
Total	24,618,000 lbs.
Cheese:	
From Eastern Canada	4,576,000 lbs.
From United States	318,010 lbs.
From New Zealand via Vancouver	33,290 lbs.
Total	4,927,300 lbs.
Eggs:	
From Eastern Canada	1,312,000 doz.
From United States	5,865,106 doz.
Total	7,177,106 doz.

Some of these imports, both from the United States and Eastern Canada, were listed merely as meat, and it is not possible to tell how much was fresh meat and how much cured. It is immaterial, from the standpoint of duty, as all meats pay the same rate. It is probable that a good deal of what is listed as meat from the United States was cured bacon, or what is known to the trade as "green salt," of which large quantities are brought in here and finished. It is likely also that

in the item of 12,048,000 lbs. of meat from Eastern Canada that a good deal of mutton from Prince Edward Island was included, as there is no definite shipment of mutton from Eastern Canada, and large quantities are known to have arrived from Prince Edward Island.

Some idea of the loss in revenue to the West, and particularly to Manitoba as the older province, in not having produced these farm products herself, may be gathered from the following:

24,618,000 lbs. of butter were brought in; the average price of butter in the West for the three provinces last year was 28c., making a total paid out for butter of \$6,893,040. The total value of dairy products produced by the three western provinces for last year was \$4,911,623, of which Manitoba produced only a little over \$2,000,000 worth. The amount of butter coming in on which duty had to be paid was 20,980,000 lbs.; the duty amounted to \$830,200.

The amount of cheese brought in was 4,953,300 lbs., which, at the average price in Manitoba, represents a value of \$643,020. Of the cheese brought in 878,710 lbs. were dutiable, and duty was paid amounting to \$26,351.30.

There were 31,976,765 lbs. of meat brought in, on which had to be paid duty amounting to \$639,535.30.

Of the 7,177,200 doz. eggs brought to the West 5,881,200 doz. were dutiable, and paid a duty on of \$176,430.

As it is entirely impossible to separate the fresh from the cured meats, the actual value of meat is difficult to ascertain, but the average dressed price of beef by the carcass in Winnipeg has been about 11c. while 16c. a lb. would be a fair valuation for all cured meats.

Of the 1,838,710 lbs. of poultry brought into the West 878,710 lbs. paid duty. Duty on poultry is 20 per cent. The bulk of the poultry coming in from the American side was turkey, and the value was at least 20c. a lb., or \$175,742; 20 per cent of this would be \$35,148.40.

There has been paid out in duty alone for products that might have been produced in the West, and the greater portion of them in Manitoba, if the conditions had been made suitable, the grand total of \$1,716,665.00. In addition to the amounts named, there were very large quantities of milk and cream brought in, as well as over 6,600,000 lbs. of condensed milk.

The item of 13,688 lbs. of veal at Vancouver is interesting. A considerable amount of this came in from the United States, from points where dairying is carried on, and a good deal of it came from New Zealand, another dairy country, indicating the revenue available from the vealing of the proportion of calves from dairy cows which are not required for keeping up the breeding stock.

A Liberal government in Manitoba will come into office pledged to co-operate with the farmers in every way possible for the purpose of bringing about conditions which will encourage the extension of diversified farming in Western Canada.

AGRICULTURAL CREDITS

One of the most important steps towards this end will be the formulation and adoption of some system by which, through the

co-operation of the government with the farmers, money for farming purposes, will be obtainable on better terms than are now available. This is a question which is now engaging the attention of all progressive governments. The systems which are already in successful operation in Germany, Ireland, France, Austria and the Australasian Dominions are now being carefully studied with a view to adopting or developing some system which will be adaptable to the conditions which obtain on this continent.

At the time of writing (April, 1914) no less than three bills are before the United States Congress designed to facilitate farm credits. One of these is the National Farm-Land Bank Bill, which was recommended by the United States Commission on Rural Credit after its lengthy investigation of European systems in the summer of 1913. This Bill provides for the creation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, of a new system of farm land banks through which it is expected farmers' needs would be met by loans on first mortgages for periods not exceeding thirty-five years. Another bill provides for the borrowing of money by the Federal government at a rate of interest not to exceed three and a half per cent, and the lending of it on first mortgages on farms at a rate not to exceed four and a half per cent.

In Western Canada interest in the matter is keen. British Columbia last year sent a special commissioner to Australia and New Zealand to report on the systems in successful operations there. Both Alberta and Saskatchewan were represented on the American commission which in 1913 investigated agricultural co-operation and rural credit systems in Europe. The Alberta government is preparing a plan, while in Saskatchewan legislation has already been enacted based upon the report of the special commission which visited Europe.

Manitoba Government Fails to Act

In Manitoba as yet nothing has been done. In the speech from the Throne at the opening of the 1913-14 session the government declared its intention of submitting legislation on the "important subject" of agricultural credits; but nothing more was heard of it. On January 22, 1914, T. C. Norris moved a resolution in the legislature dealing with this matter in these terms:

"Whereas one of the most urgent needs of Manitoba at the present time is an adequate supply of cheap money for farm purposes;

"And whereas co-operative farm credit systems for the supplying of money upon such terms have been successfully established with government assistance in various European countries, and in the Australasian Dominions of the British Empire;

"Therefore be it resolved, That in the opinion of this house, the government of this province should submit to this legislature at an early date legislation providing for the inauguration of a co-operative farm credit system, suitable to the needs of the province, which will insure a supply of funds for farm purposes at moderate rates of interest."

Supporting this resolution, Mr. Norris said that the farmer had to pay a higher rate of interest than business men in cities although he had the best security in the world—the land. Now the farmer had

to pay from 8 to 9 per cent, sometimes 10 per cent, for loans. The explanation given by financiers was that these loans to farmers were short loans. In practice, it generally worked out the other way. Mortgages were generally renewed so that the loans really became long loans, and ran from 10 to 15 years. If the farmers could also get cheaper money on long time on the co-operative plan they would be in a still better position. Mr. Norris thought such a system would be organized. By co-operating and pledging their united land holdings the farmers ought to be able to get money on long time at from 5 to 6 per cent.

The house, Mr. Norris added, should work together to formulate a system of agricultural credits that would meet the needs of the farmer. The farmers were faced by the imperative necessity of changing their agricultural methods. To go into mixed farming required capital. There were many essential preparations for such a change of method and these preparations required money.

Sir Rodmond Roblin refused to discuss the resolution on the ground that the government intended to deal with the matter itself; but the session closed without anything being done.

The Saskatchewan Plan

In Saskatchewan farm credit legislation was passed at the last session of the legislature. It follows the broad lines of the German Landschaften. It provides for the establishment of a co-operative farm mortgage association, managed by a commission, appointed at the outset by the government, which is to be supported by an advisory board representing the agricultural interests of the province. Local associations, of not less than ten members, are to be formed. The members are to be jointly and severally liable for moneys borrowed by the local association, the individual liability being limited to 50 per cent additional to the amount of the individual loan.

Money is to be raised by mortgage bonds issued by the mortgage association upon the security of the property of the members of the association, reinforced by a provincial guarantee. The experience of European countries has been that the credit of organizations of this character is so good that money can be borrowed at relatively low rates of interest. Money, thus borrowed on favorable rates of interest will be advanced to members, subject only to the overhead charges of administration. There will be no attempt to earn a profit on the money.

All loans are to be made on an amortization basis—that is to say, the annual payments are to include interest and a percentage of the principal, thus enabling the whole liability to be discharged by a series of annual payments. It is estimated that if the farmers, by pooling their credit, could borrow money for 2 per cent less than the rates they now pay, they could, by making their payments on the amortization plan, discharge their total indebtedness in about 24 years' time; by simply continuing to pay what they are now paying for interest.

Loans are to be made for productive or improvement purposes only to the extent of only 40 per cent of the value of the land pledged as security. The local association, which approves the loan, will see that the money is applied strictly to the purposes for which it is advanced.

The Act is to come into operation when a sufficient number of local associations are formed.

Credit Societies in Eastern Canada

At the Social Service Congress held in Ottawa in March, 1913, one of the speakers was Alphonse Desjardins, founder of a system of rural credit societies which now numbers 120 organizations in Quebec and 10 in Ontario. They are co-operative, and, like the Raiffeisen and Schulze-Delitzsch credit unions of Europe, provide short-time loans on personal credit. Each branch "is an association of individuals who put their savings in a common fund, and who can borrow from that fund, with the approval of the officers, upon reliable securities, material and moral. The vote is by member, not by share; the area of operation must be small, a township or parish, so that the members are mutually known; and the capital must be withdrawable, for the individual cannot afford to immobilize his small savings." The parent society, typical of all, has assets of \$270,000, of which \$240,000 are on loan, and completely cares for the financial needs of its own community. Though it has made 6,650 loans in its fourteen years history, it has not lost a cent.

The System in the Antipodes

Australia and New Zealand have met the need for cheaper money for farmers by instituting a system of state loans. The system is closely akin to the Credit Foncier of France. In a word, the state has gone into the mortgage and loan business, lending at a lower rate than the mortgage companies and saving the borrower as much as possible in fees and preliminary expenses. Each farmer is liable for his own borrowing.

The funds for making the advances are raised by the different states generally issuing mortgage bonds at four per cent, and this money is lent out at a uniform rate of five per cent to the farmers, the security for advances being from one-half to three-quarters of the estimated value of the property offered as security.

One of the most interesting and significant features of the scheme is the schedule of amortization of the loans. Payments of principal and interest are spread over periods ranging from 20 to 36½ years in half-yearly instalments. In the majority of the states the borrowers must begin to pay off the principal five years after the loan has been made, but at the option of the borrower advances may be repaid at any time.

The system came into operation in the State of Victoria in 1896 and in 15 years the trustees of the loan fund (in this case the state savings banks) foreclosed on and sold 28 farm properties. Out of these 28 farms, only in one instance, was there a loss, and that a very small amount on the principal advanced by the State.

In June, 1912, the total amount of mortgages to farmers in the State of Victoria was \$14,773,000, and the amount prepaid was \$8,053,900. At that date only ten farmers were in arrears for a total sum of \$468. When the land upon which a loan is asked is accessible by rail the inspection fee charged is \$12.17; if situated further away a pro rata increase is made in the fee. The total additional charge to the borrower for the registration and preparation of the mortgage deed is \$3.65, total expense, \$15.82.

Sayings by R. P. Roblin

JUST A FEW SAMPLES

The First Famous Saying

"I AM NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL I SAY, SPEAKING POLITICALLY."—Statement made on oath by Mr. Roblin, under cross-examination, in the presence of a crowded court room in Winnipeg, November 11, 1890.

The Abandoned Goal

"The ideal figure is a rate on wheat to Lake Superior of 10 cents a hundred, or six cents a bushel; that is the goal my government has in view. I am not able to make a statement of the means which will ensure such a rate; yet it is the goal towards which we are going, and I, as first minister, will not rest until we have secured such a rate for the farmers of Manitoba."—Sir Rodmond Roblin's first speech as Premier at Poplar Point, November, 1900.

About the Macdonald Prohibition Bill

"The wives and mothers of Manitoba ought to thank Heaven—yes, devoutly thank Heaven—that there is now in power in this province a government which has given proof of the SINCERITY OF ITS PROHIBITION PLEDGE TO THE ELECTORS by passing the Liquor Act."—Speech at Victoria Hall, Carman, October 19, 1900, in support of Mr. Colin H. Campbell's re-election as Attorney-General.

"It is no prohibition bill whatever; it is simply a bill providing for free whiskey."—Letter to W. R. Mulock, January 21, 1902.

"I never said that the Liquor Act meant free whiskey."—Speech at Winnipeg Theatre, March 10, 1902.

Differing Views About Railway Control

"I claim that in the bill before the House we have all the practical benefits of government ownership without the disadvantage of having to operate the road."—Speech in legislature, March 6, 1901.

"We cannot control a Dominion chartered railway" (the C. N. R.)—In the legislature, Jan. 7, 1907.

"As to the operation of the railways, the Canadian Northern was under a Dominion charter; and they had no more to do with the control of it than the member for Birtle."—Speech in legislature, Jan. 8, 1907.

Those Selfish Farmers

"There may be isolated instances where blockades will occur TEMPORARILY, sometimes where FARMERS SELFISHLY INSIST on loading direct on a car instead of through the elevators, thus holding the car twenty-four hours where a few minutes would suffice the other way, for the sake of a cent or two more per bushel."—Premier Roblin in interview in "Toronto Globe," October 24, 1902.

As to Telephones

"I am pleased to tell you to-night that it is our intention before one year from to-night that a good long-distance line from the City of

Winnipeg to the town of Neepawa, over which you will be able to talk for less than half that is charged by the Bell Telephone at the present time."—At Neepawn, December 20, 1906 ("Telegram" report.)

"I had in my innocence, not understanding the matter thoroughly, not being an expert, said, because I was told so, by an expert who was here, that an increase in telephones would not increase the cost of operation. But what does this report state. It is unfortunate that wrong impressions have been created in the minds of the public since the provincial government took over the telephones by the publication of untrue and erroneous statements. We know it, and my honorable friends know it, and the statements were either made wilfully or without knowledge. We have no disposition to conceal any mistakes we have made. They were made in ignorance; we had not the technical knowledge as to the operation of the system. We thought that as we added to the subscribers the rates would be reduced, but we find that is not the case."—In the legislature, April 3, 1912.

About Prof. Osborne

"A man calling himself a professor of a college, one who is supposed to teach the young men of this country to study the higher ideals. Yet he is a whitened sepulchre, and full of dead men's bones. . . . I brand Professor Osborne as a craven coward. I challenge him to go into the town of Carman and charge me there with dishonesty or immorality. He has not got the courage to do it. He will have to take with him a bodyguard to save him from physical harm, because the people in that neighborhood will not stand a slanderer."—Mr. Roblin at nomination of Tom Taylor for Centre Winnipeg ("Telegram," Feb. 12, 1907).

Note: Professor Osborne visited Carman and repeated all he had said about the administration of Mr. Roblin and his colleagues in a speech delivered at Carman in support of Mr. August on Wednesday, Feb. 27. He was well received, and Mr. Roblin's former big majority was cut in half on March 7, 1907.

Called Globe Editor a Skunk

Brockville, Ont., Sept. 28, 1908.—The feature of the Conservative mass meeting here this evening was the scathing attack on the "Globe" editor by Hon. Mr. Roblin, who likened him to Judas Iscariot.

Mr. Roblin said: "I have the same fear of J. A. Macdonald of the 'Globe' that I did when I was a boy, of a small black animal with a bushy tail and white stripes down the back, whose habits were to rob the chicken coop at night and the hens' nest by day, when no one was looking. This animal, like J. A. Macdonald, when disturbed in its acts of piracy, was content to make its defence with a malodorous smell, the only result of which was to make me sick at the stomach. I class J. A. Macdonald and his vituperation in that class, and he will remain there, a discredited, demoralized and degenerate editor, fit only for the sewer work of the Toronto 'Globe.'

Ontario newspapers of all shades of opinion took such offence at Mr. Roblin's violence on the platform that he found it discreet to cancel his appointments and return home.

A sample comment is appended from Toronto "Saturday Night" (independent): "Until the Manitoba Premier blew in from the West we have not had, in twenty years, such outbursts of denunciation as this row has occasioned. Mr. Roblin intimates that the editor of the 'Globe' reminds him of a small black animal with a bushy tail and white stripes down its back; he speaks of him as a discredited, demoralized and degenerate editor; branded as an unprincipled man; a snivelling hypocrite; a disgrace to his cloth; untrue to his profession, but now stripped of his Pharisaical robes and exposed to the public gaze in his true light of hypocrisy and cant, defending the worst crimes of the Laurier administration. It is pretty hot stuff that Mr. Roblin ladles out. It is rather too hot to be handled. It is too violent to be convincing. He uses the language of an angry man; not the language of one who reflects and knows the weight and worth of his words, and judges nicely the influences of his utterances on the popular mind. He seems to be a rough and tumble fighter, who goes into the fray with a generous supply of noise."

Better Trained Than Dr. Duval

"I have heard scores of men say that the snivelling, whining tone of voice and professional tears of the Rev. Dr. Duval reminded them in a most forceful way of Dickens' celebrated Uriah Heep. If I were as mean and cowardly, and as venomous and malicious in a desire to injure those with whom I did not agree politically as Frederic B. Duval is, I could very properly say on what I have heard and on what I have just stated, that the Rev. Dr. Duval was a hypocrite, and that his professions were like those of the Pharisees of old, who stood upon the street corners. But I do not say so, because I was trained in a school and under a flag where there was a higher and better code of honor."—In the legislature, Feb. 12, 1908.

A Precept Repudiated in the Eli Sand Case

"The public man that hesitates or refuses to have his public record enquired into and examined in the most minute detail is unworthy of the support of any people."—Premier Roblin in the Walker Theatre, Oct. 20, 1908.

The Liberals as Hyenas

Pointing his finger at Mr. Williams, Mr. Roblin said to the audience: "He would rob your hen-roosts at night. The members of the opposition are like the hyenas of old; they look for all putrid, foul, ill-smelling things they can find. Mr. Williams is the worst of them all in this particular."—Report of Premier Roblin's speech at Melita, June 30, 1910.

Refused to Descend to Brown's Level

"Mr. Roblin went on to say if he wanted to descend to the depths of garrulous sewer talk how easily he could put Mr. (Edward) Brown on his premises; if he were mean enough and would come down to Mr. Brown's level he could say: 'Yes, he had been a farmer in this province for 26 years. It was true he, by virtue of being merely a practical farmer, might not know how to manage agricultural affairs, but he, Mr. Brown (if he wanted to descend to the depths, mind you),

he, Mr. Brown, had got a lot of racing stables and had gone about the country with a lot of jockeys betting on horses, and no doubt he, Mr. Brown, might be capable of handling the agricultural affairs of the province." — "Telegram" report of the speech at Boisbriand, December 28, 1906.

A Flower of Eloquence

If the nauseating effluvia from the sink of Grit rottenness could only be prevented from escaping to other nations of the world things would not be too bad.—Speech at the Geo. E. Foster banquet at the Royal Alexandra, December, 1909.

Flashing Repartee

(In the legislature April 3, 1912)

Mr. Roblin—Any government that will listen to men like McKenzie and Henders, in connection with legislation, will be put in a hole.

T. H. Johnson—You mean McKenzie and Mann. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. Roblin—The gentleman will skin his skunks in his own back yard. (Loud laughter in house and galleries.)

The Mess of Politics

"I feel that politics is no sphere in which women should exercise herself. I do not wish to see women mixed up in the mess of politics."—Newspaper interview, Sept., 1912.

The "Jelly Bag Englishman"

"A meddlesome, impudent slanderous Samuels, who by accident holds a portfolio in the British Government making a false statement at the dictation of a small grit coterie, who stuffed the jelly bag Englishman."—Speech at Minnedosa, Nov. 7, 1913 ("Telegram" report.)

Objects to Being Opposed

"There was no ground for the opposition putting a man against him in Dufferin. They had done so in the hope that he would be kept at home during the campaign, and his opponent without any hope of winning had allowed himself to be used by a designing leader and a designing party."—At nomination meeting in Carman, Feb. 21, 1907.

"He had hoped that chivalry and sympathy would have saved him the worry of an election in Dufferin; but the junta in control of the Liberal party had decreed that he should be opposed and worried to the greatest extent possible."—At nomination meeting in Carman, June 21, 1910.

Courteous to his Hosts

"You force independence upon Canada by ignoring her. Now that your half century policy of indifference has resulted in Canada becoming a self-made giant, you are on your knees begging for commercial union. You had your chance to get reciprocity fifty years ago, but it looked like being generous to feeble Canada, and you would not take it. When you realized that Canada was becoming great, you wanted to annex her. When the tide of land-seekers from your monopoly-controlled

country commenced emigrating to Canada, you begged us for what you rejected fifty years ago."—Speech to the St. Paul Associations of Commerce, Oct. 12, 1913.

"Moral Degenerates"

"I want to say here to-night that men like Rev. C. W. Gordon, Professor Bland and Professor Osborne are not only political degenerates, but moral degenerates as well. They are a disgrace to the cloth. I know of what I speak. I know whether their statements are true. They spoke against myself, and I say their statements are a tissue of falsehood. They knew they were such, and they are willing to stand in the pulpit, and make these false statements in order to assist their party."—Speech in the Walker Theatre, March 7, 1907 ("Telegram" report.)

A Hysterical Aggregation

The following choice excerpt, though quite in the Sir Rodmond Roblin vein, is actually from the "Telegram" where it appeared on February 4, 1914:

"The opposition to the Roblin government is composed chiefly of banish-the-bar advocates, female suffrage enthusiasts, initiative and referendum alarmists, disappointed annexationists, single taxers, ante vice crusaders and a sprinkling of disappointed office-seekers. Imagine Manitoba at the mercy of this hysterical aggregation!"

Beautiful Plains Outrage

Hon. J. H. Howden owes his seat in the legislature to a miserable technicality which cheated the electors of Beautiful Plains of any opportunity to register their choice at the polls at the election of 1910. The nomination papers and the usual deposit of \$200 for F. L. Davis as the Liberal candidate were accepted by Deputy Returning Officer J. B. Barlow without question on the morning of nomination day, July 4. Later in the day Mr. Davis was informed that Barlow had declared his papers improper, and had formally declared Mr. Howden elected by acclamation. The miserable technicality on which he based this action was that the oath of attestation on the nomination paper had been declared before a police magistrate instead of a justice of the peace, as stipulated in the election act. The fact that a police magistrate has much wider powers than those of a justice of the peace, and can ordinarily fulfil any duty of a J.P. is the best evidence of the absurdity of the quibble.

Immediately the action of the returning officer had been ascertained, Mr. Davis took action, and the next day, at Portage la Prairie, he secured an injunction from Judge Macdonald to restrain the returning officer from making his official return to the clerk of the executive council. As it was stated that Barlow was sending all his papers to Winnipeg by express, the injunction was made to include the Canadian Northern Express Company.¹ Notice of the injunction was sent to both by telegraph, but in spite of this the express company's officials made delivery of the parcel on Wednesday morning, and when formally served at 9.30 Wednesday morning the Winnipeg agent stated that delivery had been made.

The injunction order was argued before Mr. Justice Mathers, who expressed himself in no uncertain words, although he found that it was impossible, under the election law, to overcome the fact that the election return had been made formal, and was therefore irrevocable.

Mr. Justice Mathers said: "If I can find any way to compel that returning officer to do his duty and hold an election in Beautiful Plains, I will certainly find that way."

"I am impressed that the actions of the returning officer Barlow were most malafides. Surely if he intended to act fairly he would have notified Mr. Davis or his agent that he found fault with his nomination papers.

"The returning officer has declared a man elected on a miserable quibble. If upheld, such action would mean the disfranchising of a whole constituency.

"In any event I think his conduct merits sharp punishment.

"If there is any means to get that writ into his possession again he will be forced to hold the election."

In spite of this scathing opinion from the bench, and of an uproar of public sentiment over the means by which he had secured his election, Mr. Howden "sat tight" and has worn his cheaply secured honors with the best grace possible. Action was taken against Barlow and against the Canadian Northern Express Company for ignoring the court injunction, and both were convicted. Barlow got off with all the costs of the action, while the express company paid a fine of \$1,000, after abandoning an appeal which it had started.

Theft of Russell Seat

In the general elections of 1910, the constituency of Russell fairly won by a majority of 6 by William Valens, was stolen from the Liberals by means of the most impudent, deliberate and dastardly election crime in the history of Manitoba politics.

When Mr. Valens was declared elected, A. L. Bonnycastle, the Conservative candidate, applied for a recount, which was held at Minnedosa before Judge Mickle July 22, 1910. The straight recount reduced Mr. Valens majority to 5, but an amazing condition found in one ballot box for poll 15, Olha school, brought to light 13 Valens ballots, which had been spoiled by the ingenious device of marking a small "x" inside letters of the name Bonnycastle. Nine ballots were found with a small "x" inside the "o"; two had the "x" inside both the "o" and the "c," while one had the "x" inside the "e," and one had a small "x" immediately after the name Bonnycastle in the small type of the second line of the ballot.

In spite of the fact that it was absolutely patent that the ballots had been tampered with after the count on election day, Judge Mickle found that the law gave him no option but to declare the ballots void. He gave his opinion very plainly, however, saying "It is shameful—nothing short of shameful, but I cannot count them."

Immediate investigation showed that the ballot boxes had lain unguarded in the office of the returning officer, Alexander McDonough, of Russell, from the night of election until sent to Minnedosa for the recount. Most of the boxes had the keys attached by a piece of string, and it became quite plain that some election crook secured entrance to the office at night and defaced the ballots so as to spoil them. This was made additionally certain from the fact that all the spoiling marks were done with a soft black pencil and that all were exactly alike, while the marks of the voters were made with a hard dry pencil and no two marks were alike, showing that they were regular and honestly marked ballots.

John H. Irwin, the deputy returning officer at Olha school, when questioned declared that there were no marks on the ballots when counted on the night of election, and this was borne out by the two Liberal scrutineers, Nicholas Zrudlo and John Brodie.

After some delay, during which he repeatedly conferred with members of the government, Mr. Bonnycastle resigned the seat, thus publicly admitting the theft of the constituency. Immediately after his resignation he was appointed to the government job of deputy provincial secretary, and on the removal of Alex. McMicken as magistrate in the provincial police court, Mr. Bonnycastle was appointed to that office, which he still holds.

At the by-election in February, 1911, Mr. Valens again contested the seat, but was defeated by F. Y. Newton.

The Agricultural College

The original location of the Agricultural College at St. Charles in the immediate neighborhood of Winnipeg, was strongly criticised as unsuitable by the Liberal opposition in the legislature. This farm comprised only 117 acres. It was six chains wide and two miles long, and the land was very heavy, making it unsuitable for experimental work. The college erected upon this site was opened November 7, 1900. In his address at the opening Mr. Roblin replied with vigor and heat to these criticisms, declining that they were unfounded, unpatriotic, inspired by partisan malice and designed to injure the reputation of the province. He held that the location was entirely suitable for the purpose of an agricultural college.

Up to the year 1910, the government had expended in buildings, etc., on this farm no less a sum than \$800,512. On October 7, 1910, the government announced that having found the site of the agricultural college much too small, the government had purchased a tract of land 572 acres in extent at St. Vital for the purpose of building a new and larger college. Construction on this new college was begun the following year, and the college was opened for students in the fall of 1913. Expenditures to date on the new college have been as follows:

1910	\$ 78,784
1911	700,024
1912	705,112
1913	1,500,060
1914 (estimated)	525,000
	<hr/>
	\$3,690,180

The area of the college farm has been reduced by the transfer to the Manitoba University of 137 acres for the purpose of supplying a site for the university.

It has been freely charged that the location of the college in the first place at St. Charles and its subsequent removal to St. Vital served in both cases the real estate speculations of members of the government and their political friends.

Roblin as a Friend of the Elevators

During the 1912 session of the legislature an opportunity was presented to Sir Rodmond Roblin to display his strong sympathy with the elevator interests as against the interest of the farmers, and he took full advantage of it.

In March, 1912, there was before the Dominion parliament a government measure amending the Manitoba Grain Act. Clause 207, added to the bill by the Hon. George E. Foster, empowered the Grain Commission in its discretion to order cars for distribution at any grain shipping point contrary to the law, if this course, in their judgment, would relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain. By this amendment the provision in the Grain Act placed there some twelve years ago by which cars are allotted in rotation in the order in which the names appear on the order book, could be made inoperative at any point in the discretion of the Grain Commission. This amendment was vigorously opposed by the Western Liberal members of parliament, and strong protests were wired to Ottawa by Western Grain Growers' Associations. The clause, it was pointed out, was being placed in the Act in the interests of the elevator and railway interests which, by co-operating, could produce congestion at any point, and thus bring about the suspension of the Act.

Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, was, however, obdurate, and the bill as it passed the House of Commons contained the objectionable provision. On its third reading the Liberals as a party voted against it, and were joined in their opposition by W. H. Sharpe and Dr. Schaffner, two Manitoba Conservative M.P.'s. The Western farmers prepared to resume the fight in the Senate, and for this purpose sent a delegation made up of E. J. Fream, representing Alberta, F. W. Green, Saskatchewan and Roderick McKenzie, of Manitoba, to Ottawa, to make their objections known to the Senate.

While the matter was in this stage at Ottawa G. H. Malcolm, M.P.P. for Birtle, moved in the Manitoba legislature on March 25 a resolution asking the House to petition the Senate of Canada to strike out the objectionable clause.

Distribution of Cars

This bill, Mr. Malcolm pointed out, had already passed the House of Commons. It would, therefore, appear to be asking a good deal to suggest that this resolution be adopted. He must, however, do his duty in this connection and he hoped that the government would find it possible to approve. The farmers of the province certainly wanted the law to remain in its present form. If a provision was made, such as that contemplated in the new bill, it was inevitable that abuses would occur, and the advantage for which the farmers had worked for twenty years would be lost. The proposal that the law requiring that all applicants for cars should be treated alike should be amended, as proposed, was, however, exceedingly disquieting, and was viewed with

great uneasiness. Under the law it would be possible to work various schemes. Stations would be left without cars until the elevators were filled. Then a large number of cars would be sent in to relieve the elevators. The farmer, pressed by his creditors, would be compelled to sell the elevators, and the old trouble of a wide spread between the street and the track prices would again arise.

Mr. Roblin spoke strongly against the action proposed by Mr. Malcolm in the matter. The question belonged to the federal house. So far as the farmers were concerned, he was very doubtful of their position on the matter. He had not received a single communication on the subject from a grain grower. He was of the opinion that Mr. Malcolm's imagination had contributed the idea that the farmers were opposed to the change. The real cause of any protest from the province was the action of Messrs. Henders and McKenzie and their organ. Were these the kind of men that the house thought should be heard with respect? He did not think so. He looked with much suspicion on them. The suggestion made by Mr. Malcolm was one to the effect that the grain commission was not to be trusted. This was ground which could not be fairly taken. It was not yet known who would constitute this commission, and it was not to be admitted that the commissioners would fail to do their work fairly and impartially. The provision of the law appeared to be a very fair one. Mr. Roblin closed his speech by moving the adjournment of the debate, which was equivalent to killing the resolution.

Fortunately, despite the refusal of the Manitoba legislature at Sir Rodmond's behest to intervene in their behalf, the Western farmers were able to make their case good at Ottawa. After the three Western representatives had made their objections known to the Senate committee, the bill came up in the Senate for consideration. Senator T. O. Davis, of Prince Albert, at once moved for the deletion of the objectionable provision. Hon. Senator Lougheed, the government leader in the Upper House, knowing that the Liberal majority in the Senate intended to strike out the provision, made a virtue of necessity and agreed to the amendment. He said that while the government was of the opinion that the bill as drafted would not be to the detriment of the farmers the feeling in the West was very strong against this section of the bill. He would therefore, on behalf of the government, withdraw it.

Against Farmers in 1898

This was by no means the first time that Mr. Roblin had made it quite clear that he was opposed to the farmers being given any grain-shipping facilities other than those supplied by the line elevators.

Away back in 1898, when he was leader of the opposition in the Manitoba legislature, he fiercely resisted a motion by W. F. Sirett, M.P.P. for Beautiful Plains, seconded by Jas. Riddell, M.P.P. for Lorne, asking the Dominion parliament to so amend the Railway Act as to compel the railways to supply cars for loading purposes direct to farmers.

Mr. Roblin, speaking on March 23, 1808, announced that he was against Mr. Strett's motion and he rebuked "the professional agitators to be found both inside and outside the house," who loved to attack the men they had to do business with. Mr. Roblin held there was a race between men to see who could make the most capital with the farmers. WITH SOME MEN IT DID NOT MATTER THAT THIS TIMING MEANT CONFISCATION. Did the representatives from Beautiful Plains and Lorne not know that British money had been invested in these elevators on the strength of regulation in an Act of Parliament? WAS THE MEMBER FOR LORNE (MR. RIDDELL) WILLING TO CONFISCATE THIS MONEY?

Again, as president of the Dominion Elevator Company, Mr. Roblin headed the delegation representing the elevator companies, which went to Ottawa in May, 1809, to oppose the Douglas Bill, providing for flat warehouses, and compelling the railways to do business with them. The "Telegram" of May 11, 1809, contains a dispatch from Ottawa reporting the proceedings of the day before at the sitting of the special committee of the house to which Dr. Douglas' Elevator Bill had been referred. After reporting a speech by Dr. Douglas in support of his measure, the dispatch continues:

"Mr. R. P. Roblin was next heard. He represented the Dominion Elevator Company. Mr. Roblin said that the reason why they asked a month's delay was owing to the large amounts of wheat in the elevators which were waiting shipment, and which could not be sent out until they returned. On his own wheat at Fort William he would lose \$2,000, and if he waited very long it would be \$5,000."

Further on, after remarks by Vice-President Shaughnessy, of the C. P. R., and Dr. Douglas, Mr. Roblin is thus reported in the "Telegram" dispatch:

"He went on to show that there was competition in the business and no combine. There were, for instance, fourteen street buyers in the City of Winnipeg. There were others who bought by the car over the heads of the elevator men. The elevator men courted competition. BUT THEY OBJECTED TO THEIR BUSINESS BEING DESTROYED BY SUCH LEGISLATION AS WAS PROPOSED."

If Sir Rodmond Roblin had had his way the farmers of the West would never have been allowed to ship their wheat over loading platforms or through flat warehouses.

Good Roads

Since the provincial Liberal convention of 1907 the party has consistently advocated a broad policy of road building throughout the provinces with the all-important provision that all expenditures for road building should be made through the municipal authorities, and not direct to persons working on road construction, as is the policy of the Roblin government. The necessity for this change has been borne in for years by the outrageous manner in which the Roblin government has manipulated expenditures for roads for election purposes, starting work indiscriminately in all parts of the province where a judicious use of the money might be expected to bring the largest return in votes where they were most needed. A glaring example of this was the Gimli by-election, when upward of \$94,000 was spent with little to show for it in actual road building.

At the provincial convention of 1914, the Liberal policy was enunciated in the following resolution:

"That inasmuch as the prosperity of the province depends in a great measure upon the existence of good roads, the Liberal party re-affirms its policy of co-operating with the municipalities in the matter of road building, and declares that all provincial aid given should be spent through the municipal councils."

In 1907 and 1910 the convention resolutions, which were practically identical, were very similar to that of 1914, reading:

"That inasmuch as the prosperity of the province depends, in large measure, upon the existence of good roads, the Liberal party pledges itself to a definite policy, whereby it can co-operate with the municipalities in building a first-class system of thoroughfares."

In the legislature the policy of co-operation with the municipalities has been consistently advocated by the Liberal opposition. In March, 1910, and in February, 1913, amendments were offered in the debate on supply which would have provided that all expenditures for roads should be made through municipal councils. On each occasion the amendment was voted down by the straight government majority, and the ministers showed little disposition to discuss the matter at all.

In 1914 the government amended the Good Roads Act and to some extent adopted the very principle for which the Liberals had been fighting since 1907. The new Act provides for free service of government engineers to the municipalities and an arrangement whereby the government will assist with cash grants of from 33 to 66½ per cent of the cost of roads built under the Act, the expenditures to be made by the municipality, but under restrictions and supervision of the commission of three appointed by the government. This latter provision was strongly criticized by the Liberal members, and T. C. Norris offered an amendment providing that the public utilities commissioner should be appointed as arbitrator to adjudicate in any case where there was a difference of opinion between the government and the municipality. Hon. Mr. Montague, who introduced and spoke to the new Act, claimed that this would be a useless provision and

Premier Roblin took similar ground, declaring besides that it had never been contemplated that the utilities commissioner should supersede the government of which he was the creature. Mr. Norris' amendment was voted down by the straight government majority.

At the annual convention of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities at Portage la Prairie in November, 1913, the good roads legislation was discussed at length and dissatisfaction with the government's policy was so marked that a resolution offered by the Manitoba Good Roads Association asking the government to construct main leading highways was voted down by a large and vociferous majority. Reeve Forke, of Pipestone, voiced the sentiments of the convention when he declared amid great applause that the principle of municipalities having to beg from the government was wrong and immoral. Something of the intention of the government to amend the Good Roads Act was known in the convention, and several speakers declared their conviction that the government would never consent to arbitration for the simple reason that it would always hold on to its control of road building for political purposes. It was also argued that even if larger grants were made to the municipalities, they would go only to the favored municipalities that were friendly to the government.

Municipal Control of Taxation

At the Liberal convention, March, 1914, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved that this convention go on record as favoring legislation which will give municipalities local option as to classification of properties for taxation."

This resolution is designed to meet the demand for municipal authority to exempt certain forms of property from taxation. Several Manitoba municipalities have requested this power from the legislature and in each case have been met with flat refusal. Transcona and Winnipeg have both had this experience. Frankly this is a measure of home rule in taxation, permitting adoption of municipal single tax, if such is desired by the municipal electors. This right is enjoyed by all municipalities in British Columbia and Saskatchewan. In Alberta it is compulsory. Manitoba should be as progressive as any of the Western provinces.

The principle behind this proposed legislation is thoroughly democratic and in keeping with the best principles of Direct Legislation. The decision as to the method and kind of municipal taxation is not a matter that should come under the purview of the legislature, but should be determined solely by those who pay such taxes.

Corruption in Gimli By-Election

The by-election in Gimli on May 12, 1913, when E. L. Taylor was elected was marked by an unprecedented carnival of corruption. On February 6, 1914, in the legislature, T. H. Johnson, West Winnipeg, made detailed charges on his own responsibility as a member of the house and put the whole matter up to the Roblin government.

On February 10, E. L. Taylor replied with a number of affidavits, making general and specific charges against Liberal workers in the election, and at the same time made the offer that if the Liberals would withdraw the petition to void the election then pending in the courts, he would move to place the whole matter before the house committee on privileges and elections for investigation.

To this T. C. Norris replied on February 13. He moved for a Royal Commission to make full investigation and refused the suggestion of Mr. Taylor on the ground that an investigation before a committee of which a majority were members of the Conservative party could not be a fair investigation. Premier Roblin himself refused to entertain the suggestion of a Royal Commission and the matter thus dropped.

The affidavits read by E. L. Taylor were strongly challenged by the Liberal opposition and demands made that they be laid on the table so that they could be examined and if necessary made the basis for action by the men assailed. This was refused by Premier Roblin himself. Two of these affidavits were absolutely disposed of within a day or two.

One charge read by Mr. Taylor reflected on W. Molloy, M.P.P. for LaVerandrye, and the affidavit purported to be signed by Jos. DeLaronde, of Oak Point. Within a few days an affidavit was secured from DeLaronde, in which he swore that he knew nothing of the affidavit read by Taylor; that he had never made such an affidavit, and that its contents were false. The affidavit read by Taylor had a peculiar later history. Taunted by Mr. Molloy, Premier Roblin produced the alleged affidavit and laid it on the table. The next day, when it was wanted for examination the clerk of the house spent several minutes looking, but could not find it, and admitted his belief that it had been removed.

Another affidavit purporting to be signed by W. Sutherland, of Ashern, made charges against Alex. McCurdy. Sutherland denied having made such an affidavit and swore an affidavit that the statements read by Taylor were false, and that he had never made such statements nor signed such an affidavit. He swore that he had been paid \$25 by a hotelkeeper, Dan Hunter, to make an affidavit of a totally different nature, which he had been taken to the Moose Club in Winnipeg to sign. He also swore that part of the \$25 was paid to him by the bartender at the Moose Club, after he had visited the Conservative Club rooms with Hunter.

Another alleged affidavit reflecting on S. Hart Green, North Winnipeg, was absolutely disproved by Mr. Green on the floor of the house, Mr. Green proving that he had never in his life been in the district where it was alleged he had been working on stated dates. On one of the days cited he was in Winnipeg throughout the day.

The Specific Charges

The charges read by Thos. H. Johnson in the legislature, February 6, 1914, are reproduced in full:

"I, on my responsibility as a member of this house, charge:

"1. That public moneys were improperly and corruptly employed in influencing electors to vote for E. L. Taylor at a by-election in the constituency of Gimli on the 12th day of May, 1913, clear evidence of which is to be found in items in the public accounts aggregating some ninety-three thousand dollars expended directly by the government.

"2. That bribery was extensively practised in this by-election on behalf of the said E. L. Taylor.

"3. That corrupt treating was carried throughout the constituency to a degree never before known.

"4. That liquor was freely dispensed by agents of E. L. Taylor in local option territory and elsewhere.

"5. That intimidation was largely practised.

"6. That employees of the Manitoba government and officers of the law were personally guilty of acts of intimidation, bribery, corrupt treating and distribution of liquor.

"7. That violators of the law in this election were protected by officers of the government charged with the enforcement of law and order.

"8. That prominent among the workers and agents of E. L. Taylor were owners, managers, employees and habitues of notorious drinking resorts in Winnipeg and 'clubs of that class.'

"9. That this campaign of corruption, intimidation, bribery and illegal use of liquor was directed and managed by prominent members of the civil service of Manitoba."

Mr. Johnson then submitted the following instances of corruption of which he had proof, stating that it was only a portion of the evidence in his possession:

Ross, J. Adam, provincial constable, stationed at Gimli during election, promised elector \$25 in road work; bought drinks for Taylor in bar of Gimli hotel, May 9; produced handcuffs and threatened arrest of those not supporting Taylor; offered elector money to support Taylor.

Elector received \$1,100 from government, and spent it on road work, hiring parties on condition that they voted for Taylor; gave work on condition that recipient voted for Taylor; received liquor from Lake View house on order of dominion fish inspector.

Armstrong, provincial road inspector, worked for Taylor at Ashern; told elector was using road argument; offered elector \$10 and improved road if he would vote for Taylor; used threats to elector that roads would not be improved if Taylor were defeated.

Gerrie, Charles, public works dept., had charge of election organization on C. N. R. line; went out in constituency every other day, and took parties of workers; came to town with Taylor in a car, the day after election; Gerrie informed parties that he had been using liquor in Scotch Bay district.

Peters, Ted, bartender in the Midland Hotel, stationed at Ashern; passed bottle of whisky among voters on election day; was present when liquor was taken from barrel in Whitaker's livery stable.

Byrnes, Charles, proprietor of West Hotel; stationed at Ashern, on May 10 and 11 gave liquor to electors in boarding house.

Byrnes, Larry, of West Hotel; stationed at Ashern; told elector on May 8 that he had large quantity of liquor coming to Ashern following day; gave voter a drink.

Budd, treated electors at Ashern to liquor.

Becker, provincial constable, stationed at Lake View Hotel, Gimli, during election campaign.

McKarsky, provincial constable, stationed at Lake View Hotel, Gimli, during election campaign. Present at meeting at Jadek, May 8, where liquor was distributed.

Campbell, Alex., machine agent of Ashern, offered elector ten dollars to vote for Taylor; said roads would not be built if Taylor were not elected.

Whitaker, William, of Ashern, livery keeper, had barrel of whisky in his stable; gave liquor to electors; told electors that he got sixteen cases of whisky on Sunday, May 11.

Miller, Chris., of Ashern, gave bottle of whisky to elector; said he had got it from the Conservatives.

Fisher, E. B., of Winnipeg, Conservative organizer; it was in his office that electors were given money to go to Ashern to vote for Taylor.

Stefanik, Theo., of Winnipeg, addressed a meeting at Jadek, in Liebman's store, on May 8, at which liquor was distributed.

Leibman, A. D., of Rembrandt, storekeeper; meeting held in his store, where liquor was distributed.

Marks, B., teacher, present at Taylor meeting at house of Peter Wotwowych, distributed liquor.

Bodnar, John, teacher, present at Taylor meeting at house of Peter Wotwowych; distributed liquor.

Meyr, Louis, of Arborg, drove load of whisky to Fisher branch through local option territory, J. B. Lauzon accompanying.

Krowyski, John, distributed liquor while canvassing for Taylor.

Haas, Christian, of Rembrandt, storekeeper, distributed liquor among electors.

Lakastuck, William, of Rembrandt, storekeeper, distributed liquor among electors.

Marks, Johann; whisky passed around after Taylor meeting held in his house.

Szablewski, F. S., Dominion government service, paid men for doing road work; liquor distributed at the same time; distributed money day before election, and told electors to vote for Taylor; gave orders for liquor for distribution to the extent of \$300 at Gimli house.

Potsoski, Wotko, distributed liquor at house of Annie Obak.

Nykorchuk, J., of Komarno, provincial constable, hired elector to work on road on condition that he vote for Taylor.

Hednuk, Andrew, of Rembrandt, distributed liquor among the electors.

Cope, Charles, of Winnipeg; took electors to Fisher's office on Sunday, May 11, where money was paid.

White, James, provincial constable of license department; distributed liquor at meetings the day before election.

Kaminski, of the license department; gave orders for liquor at Gimli Hotel for distribution among electors.

Free Distribution of Liquor

Mr. Johnson then gave a list of the more spirituous offences which had been committed, as follows:

Gerrie admitted that he used liquor in Scotch Bay district.

May 10 and May 11, electors were treated to liquor at Ashern by Byrnes and Gudd.

Dozens of empty whisky bottles were thrown in lane alongside the Conservative headquarters in Ashern.

Liquor was placed in Whitaker's livery stable at Ashern.

Ashern electors were treated by Ted Peters, bartender.

Liquor was distributed by Larry Byrnes at Ashern.

Large quantity of liquor received at Ashern, Friday, May 9; elector given bottle of whisky on election day.

Two cases of liquor placed in cellar of Hyde & Pickergill's store, Ashern early in May.

Sixteen cases of liquor received at Ashern by William Whitaker on Sunday, May 11.

Free distribution of liquor at Christian Haas' store at Rembrandt on May 9.

Distribution of liquor at Lakastuck's store at Rembrandt, May 10.

Two barrels of whisky and several packages at Arborg station, the morning of May 6; same evening two additional barrels received; shipped back down the line.

Liquor delivered by proprietor of Lake View Hotel, Gimli, to electors, on order of fish inspector.

Liquor at the house of Johann Marks, where Taylor meeting was held on Sunday, May 11.

Liquor in A. Obak's house, and freely distributed.

Berowski produced bottle of whisky said to have been obtained from E. L. Taylor.

Liquor distributed by Andrew Hednuk at Rembrandt.

Liquor distributed at Taylor meeting at Leibman's store, Jadek, May 8. Liquor arrived at night by train.

School teachers produced liquor at Taylor meeting.

Load of whisky driven north from Arborg by Louis Meyr.

Liquor employed by John Krowyski, a canvasser for Taylor.

Liquor bought in Gimli Hotel for electors by Alex. Grabowski, May 9, while canvassing for Taylor.

Treating by J. Adam Ross, provincial constable, in Gimli Hotel.

Proprietor of Gimli Hotel gave out over \$300 worth of liquor upon orders issued by Szablewski and Kaminsky, who works in license department.

Activities of J. B. Lauzon

Following were the series of charges against Mr. Lauzon read by Mr. Johnson:

- (1) Lauzon arrived at Fisher branch May 7, with load of half-breeds; treated with whisky; canvassing for Taylor.
- (2) Took seven or eight electors aside; these electors returned with bottles of whisky given to them by Lauzon.
- (3) Lauzon had a stock of whisky and cigars at the Mission house in Fisher branch district, May 9, 1913.
- (4) Lauzon was seen on the road in local option territory on May 10 with a load of whisky in Taylor's interests.
- (5) Was master of ceremonies at Taylor's committee room at Fisher Branch on Sunday, May 11, when the committee room was piled high with boxes of whisky and a great many electors were drunk and fighting all day in committee room.
- (6) Promised roads if father and son would vote for Taylor.
- (7) Boasted he had plenty of whisky in Taylor's committee room.
- (8) Boasted that he had all the whisky and money he wanted to win the election.
- (9) Lauzon treated on whisky at Prygrocki's store, May 7.
- (10) Offered money to electors to stay at home.
- (11) Offered \$100 to elector to vote and work for Taylor; raised his offer to \$300.
- (12) Lauzon held public meeting after mass on Sunday, May 11, and publicly invited the people to come and have a drink.
- (13) In the house near the church the table was piled high with whisky bottles. Lauzon passed around whisky, soliciting votes for Taylor.
- (14) Lauzon offered to grade half mile of road running around elector's farm on condition that elector voted for Taylor.
- (15) Gave three bottles of whisky to elector to vote for Taylor.
- (16) Said to elector that if he wanted more to come to the Conservative committee rooms and that elector could have all the whisky he wanted.
- (17) At Arborg, May 3, Lauzon said to elector "Name your price to vote and work for 'Taylor.'"
- (18) Lauzon offered to build 8 miles of road if people would vote for Taylor.
- (19) Offered to get patents for people's homesteads if they would vote for Taylor.
- (20) Announced that no favors would be extended to people if they failed to vote for Taylor.
- (21) May 8, Lauzon promised new road around an elector's farm if he would vote for Taylor.

(22) Gave elector a bottle of whisky.

(23) Lauzon took from a barrel in a wagon on the public highway a bottle of whisky and treated and asked elector to vote for Taylor.

(24) Sunday, May 11, Fisher branch: Lauzon distributed whisky to 30 or 40 electors and handed out bottles of whisky.

Other Irregularities at Fisher Branch

Mr. Johnson then made charges dealing with the campaign activities of Nikolo Prygrocki, storekeeper of Fisher branch. On May 10, Fisher branch, he treated all and sundry on what he called "Conservative whisky;" promised money to vote for Taylor; subsequently treated, hired man at \$2.50 per day to canvass for Taylor. May 8, paid man \$10 for four days' work, canvassed for Taylor; promised all the whisky electors wanted to drink.

Hamelin, who was one of the Conservative workers, at Fisher branch, according to charges made by Mr. Johnson, gave two bottles of whisky to elector in Conservative committee room and gave a glass of brandy to same elector.

Liquor in Local Option Territory

A Winnipeg hotelkeeper, Mr. Johnson said, had a suit case filled with Schlitz beer and Gooderham and Worts whisky in local option territory and treated electors on beer and whisky in local option territory. This hotelkeeper had stated that his orders had been given him by a member of government personally over the telephone, that he had been told to "lose no time," so he hit the road at once with ammunition.

On Sunday, May 11, a liveryman with four others, arrived at the house of Fred. Scytucki with four kegs of beer and quantities of Bologna sausage and bread. They opened one keg and treated all around on what they called "Conservative beer," and the slogan was "Vote for Taylor." These parties held an afternoon meeting and the arguments were "bread, beer and Bologna sausage." Two provincial constables, named White and Jankowski, spoke at this meeting. At this meeting a debt, owing by province to an elector for one day's work, years old was paid for by a Taylor agent to get him to vote for Taylor.

Further Charges

Mr. Johnson charged that Fred Szczucki, at Poll No. 17, dispensed whisky all day election day for votes for Taylor, and after the close of the poll took the barrel of beer into the poll and the electors sat around drinking from it. Elector at this poll was offered road work and whisky if he would vote for Taylor. Constables at this poll distributed whisky.

Constable White, at a meeting held at the house of Cz dor Szleniski, on Friday, May 9, dispensed "Conservative beer." White and Szleniski promised roads at this meeting if electors would vote for Taylor.

Referring to the case of a debt owing by the province being paid if the creditor voted for Mr. Taylor, Mr. Johnson stated, marked a step lower in degradation than any of the other acts of corruption. If

the debt were a just one, he stated, the refusal to pay it constituted a dragging of the name of the province into the whole discreditable business.

Mr. Johnson emphasized the fact that the instances which he had given only constituted a portion of his evidence.

THE GIMLI ELECTION TRIAL FARCE

The petition to unseat E. L. Taylor for irregularities in the by-election of May 12, 1913, was filed at the Court House, Winnipeg, about 11.30 a.m., July 5, 1913. An attempt was made to serve Mr. Taylor at his office at 12 o'clock, but he could not be found. As it was rumored that he was going to Kenora, Ont., outside the jurisdiction of the court, watch was kept at the C. P. R. station, but he was not seen. At 4 o'clock enquiry at his residence brought the answer that Mr. Taylor had gone to Kenora, and it later transpired that he had taken the train at 1.30. For several days thereafter Mr. Taylor's house and office were visited regularly, but he was still presumably at Kenora.

On July 9, an order was secured extending the time for service 10 days. On July 18 another order of extension of time was secured, and on July 24 an order was secured for substitutional service. Counsel for Mr. Taylor applied to Chief Justice Mathers to set aside the second order for extension of time, also the order for substitutional service on the ground that he had no jurisdiction. Chief Justice decided that he did not have the necessary jurisdiction. The matter was then taken to the Court of Appeals, which reversed Chief Justice Mathers' finding and decided that he had the power to issue both orders and that either one of them would have been sufficient.

A. J. Andrews, acting for Mr. Taylor, then applied to the Court of Appeal for an order staying proceedings, pending an appeal to the Privy Council from the finding of the Court of Appeal. Mr. Andrews presented a petition to this effect, which was argued at length, and the Court of Appeal after some time gave judgment dismissing the petition.

Appointment was then made for the hearing of the preliminary objections to the election petition, when Mr. Andrews secured a further postponement on no other ground than that it was usual to grant such postponements in election trials.

Eventually the trial was set for December 5. Some of the objections raised by Mr. Andrews reached the height of absurdity, but indicated very plainly that no possible trick was to be overlooked that would delay the trial. Mr. Justice Curran made some caustic remarks on the procedure, during which he said:

"I think the sooner the legislature introduces a little common-sense into the trial of these election petitions the better for the community. For it seems to me that there is no class of case tried in our courts that is so attended with artifices, loopholes and so on of every description to the profit or failure of somebody as in these election matters. And it seems to me high time some common-sense rule should be introduced to aid proof of these documents."

During the course of Mr. Andrews' lengthy objections to Dominion notes being considered money, Mr. Justice Curran remarked;

"I think to ask for, or require any further evidence to show so obvious a fact, would be simply making a burlesque of the courts of justice, especially after the evidence that has been given by the Receiver-General of Canada, who has been in that office for forty-one years, and who says that it is good and lawful money of Canada, such as he would accept officially, and who identifies the paper, the lithographing, the official signatures. And to say that that would not be proof of current money of Canada I think would be absurd, and I don't think it is necessary to go further in the matter of proof."

Before the trial had proceeded further the legislature was called in session and according to the law the trial was automatically stopped. During the session, in February, the government "steam rollered" an amendment to the Controverted Elections Act offered by Thos. H. Johnson, West Winnipeg, which would have given the province a simple and effective law, void of technicalities and quibbles. A week later the Roblin government passed its new Act, which has rendered impossible any further attempt to force the Gimli election to trial.

The Boundary Settlement and Natural Resources

The Dominion parliament and the Manitoba legislature by joint legislation in 1912 ratified an arrangement providing for an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba arrived at by the governments of Manitoba and the Dominion. This, in brief, was the settlement arrived at:

Area—The province was extended north to the 60th parallel of latitude. The easterly boundary line of the new territory ran from the northeast corner of the old Province of Manitoba, northeasterly to Island Lake; thence northeasterly to the point where the 90th meridian of longitude intersects the shore of Hudson Bay; thence following the shore until the northern boundary was reached. This increased the area of the province from 73,732 square miles to 251,832 square miles. The remaining portion of Keewatin lying between the eastern boundary of Manitoba and the Albany River, amounting to 140,000 square miles, was added to Ontario.

This extension of territory was identical with that offered to Manitoba by the former Dominion government in 1908 and embodied in the resolution adopted by the Dominion Parliament July 16, 1908. At that time the Roblin government refused to accept this allotment of territory, claiming that Ontario had no right to any territory north of the Albany River. In his speech in the Walker Theatre during the 1907 campaign Mr. Roblin declared that Ontario was constitutionally barred from claiming any portion of Keewatin, and said that he would go to the foot of the throne if the whole territory was not transferred to the Province of Manitoba.

Right of Way to Ontario

The Dominion government in the 1912 settlement took power to transfer to the Province of Ontario the ownership of a strip of land five miles wide from the Ontario boundary to the Nelson River, with a frontage on the eastern side of this river ten miles long and half a mile deep. This, it was explained in Parliament by Mr. Borden, was for the purpose of giving Ontario a right of way for a railway and a seaport on Hudson Bay. (This frontage on Nelson River was located in the year 1912 by an expedition sent out by the Ontario government.)

Allowance for Government

This provision remained unchanged. The yearly allowance for local and government purposes under the B.N.A. Act of 1907 remained at \$190,000.

Per Capita Grant

This also remained unchanged, being 80c. per head on the estimated population at the time.

Indemnity in Lieu of Lands

The Dominion government adjusted the annual payment in lieu of public lands to the basis fixed for Alberta and Saskatchewan by the

Dominion legislation of 1905. This increased the annual indemnity from \$100,000 to \$502,500. From this, however, there were certain abatements. There was an annual deduction on account of swamp lands, which had been sold by the Province of Manitoba amounting to \$134,230, and a further deduction on account of university lands of \$15,000, making a total annual deduction of \$149,230, leaving a net indemnity to the province of \$413,270 as against \$100,000 allowed to the old Province of Manitoba.

Restoration of Swamp Lands

As it was a condition of the settlement that all the land of the province should belong to the Dominion government, the province did not receive the natural resources of the added territory, and, further, had to restore to the Dominion government the swamp lands within the older Province of Manitoba to which, under the settlement of 1885, the province was entitled. Of these lands there had actually been transferred to Manitoba up to the end of 1909 about 2,000,000 acres, and over 800,000 acres had been sold by the province. The province had to reconvey to the Dominion the balance of these lands and to forego its claims to the balance amounting to over 6,000,000 acres. Mr. Borden in the House of Commons on February 27, 1912, read the following statement as to the area of swamp lands in Manitoba which were thus restored to the Dominion by the province:

Swamp lands conveyed to Manitoba up to the end of 1909, approximately	\$2,009,368.00
Sold by the province as per statement furnished by the province, January, 1912	838,484.16
Balance to be reconveyed to the Dominion under Bill.....	1,170,883.84
Estimate of swamp lands in the existing Province of Mani- toba still available:	
(a) Balance as above	1,170,883.84
(b) Classed as swamp lands by Dominion government but not transferred	431,948.00
(c) Estimated acreage of swamp in surveyed part of the province, exclusive of (b)	1,760,000.00
(d) Estimate of swamp lands in unsurveyed part of the province	4,870,000.00
Total estimated swamp lands	\$8,232,831.84

In Lieu of Debt

The capital allowance in lieu of debt on which interest at 5 per cent is paid yearly was increased from \$3,500,000, the amount fixed by the legislation of 1885, to the sum which had been allowed Alberta and Saskatchewan, \$8,107,500. Interest at 5 per cent on this amounted to \$405,375, less \$23,780, being interest at 5 per cent on \$475,816, which had been withdrawn from the capital fund by the province in previous years.

This made the total subsidy allowed Manitoba for the year beginning July 1st, 1912, as follows:

Allowance for government and local purposes, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. (1) (a)	\$ 100,000.00
Eighty cents per head on 455,614 population, as per census of June, 1911, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. (1) (b)	304,401.20
Indemnity for want of public lands	\$502,500.00
Swamp lands deduction, about.....	\$134,230.00
University lands deduction	15,000.00
	<hr/>
	140,230.00
	<hr/>
Interest at 5 per cent on \$8,107,500	\$405,375.00
Less interest at 5 per cent on \$475,810.15	23,780.81
	<hr/>
	381,584.10
Total	\$1,349,345.39

The subsidy for the older Province of Manitoba under the previous arrangement totalled \$833,438.26.

By dating back the arrangement to July 1st, 1908, the difference between these two amounts for a period of four years, was held to be arrears due the province by the Dominion. This sum, amounting to \$2,193,357, paid to the province in cash.

Further, a special allowance for provincial buildings, to the amount of \$201,723, payable in two annual instalments, was made by the Dominion government.

THE REJECTED PROPOSITION OF 1911

In March, 1911; the Dominion (Liberal) government had made a proposition for a settlement which had been unanimously rejected by the Manitoba legislature as unsatisfactory by resolution moved by Mr. Roblin and seconded on behalf of the opposition by V. Winkler, M.P.P. This proposed to leave with the province the ownership of the swamp and university lands, to increase the annual allowance in lieu of lands by \$200,000 (rising ultimately to \$300,000) with an increased revenue from the enlarged population on the basis of 80 cents per head.

Contrasting this with the Roblin-Borden settlement made a year later, this is the comparison:

Yearly receipts under settlement	\$1,349,345
Yearly receipts under rejected 1911 proposal	1,033,438

This leaves a cash difference of \$315,907 a year in favor of the Roblin-Borden settlement of 1912; but against this it must be borne in mind that under the 1911 proposal the province would have retained the ownership of over seven million acres of swamp lands and also secured possession of the swamp lands of the added territory.

Value of the Swamp Lands

There can be no just comparison of the two offers which does not take into account the value of swamp lands renounced by the Province of Manitoba. As to the value of these lands there is no lack of official statements placing it at a high figure.

In his speech at Indian Head on December 18, 1901, Sir Rodmond Roblin declared that the total acreage of provincial lands was 7,000,000, and he placed the average value at \$3 per acre, making a total of \$21,000,000. Year after year the Provincial Treasurer, in making the annual financial statement in the legislature, has set forth these lands conspicuously in the list of the province's assets.

In his statement to the Canadian House of Commons, Feb. 27, 1912, Hon. W. T. White stated that up to that time the province had sold 838,484 acres for \$3,137,300—an average of \$3.74 an acre. According to the estimate submitted by Mr. Borden, the province, as a condition of the boundary settlement, gave up its right to 7,400,000 acres at an average price of \$3 an acre. This would amount to \$22,200,000, equivalent, on a four per cent basis, to \$880,000 a year. Much of this land has no immediate cash value, it is true, but each year would have seen a proportion of this land become saleable, with the strong probabilities that the cash receipts from swamp lands would have exceeded year by year the difference shown above between the subsidy under the 1912 agreement and the subsidy provided for by the abortive proposition of 1911.

THE NATURAL RESOURCES

No attempt was made by the Manitoba government to secure a settlement by the transfer to the province of the natural resources of the province in conformity with pledges made repeatedly by Mr. Borden when leader of the opposition in the Dominion Parliament; but in submitting the Bill ratifying the boundary agreement to the legislature, March 28, 1912, Sir Rodmond Roblin held out the hope that in time Mr. Borden would supplement his pledges.

Mr. Borden's Pledges

Mr. Borden declared on many occasions his intention of transferring the public domain to the three Western provinces if given power. This was part of the Halifax platform of 1907, and was confirmed by statements made by Mr. Borden to Western audiences—at Regina on Oct. 16, 1907; at Regina on June 22, 1911; at Battleford, July, 1911; at Winnipeg June, 1911; at Brandon June, 1911. In his speech at Brandon he said:

"In 1902, in 1905, in 1907, and again in 1910, we have stood for the right of the Western provinces to own and control their public domain. It is the right of the people in those provinces to have their public lands and natural resources administered by their own governments under the control of their own legislatures. They say that they are free men, and being free men in a free country have as good a right to control through their own local legislatures, and by their own provincial executives, the administration of their public lands and natural resources as have the people of any of the Eastern provinces who enjoy and have enjoyed that right. The Liberal-Conservative party supports that claim, and will enforce it at the first opportunity."

The Request of the Premiers Refused

Last November the following joint letter was addressed to Mr. Borden by the Premiers of the three prairie provinces:

December 22, 1913.

The Right Hon. R. L. Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—After having an interview with you in regard to the questions in respect of which the prairie provinces received different treatment from the other provinces of Canada, and, at your suggestion, a meeting of the Premiers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta was held, and it has been agreed between us to make you on behalf of said provinces the proposal that the financial terms already arranged between the provinces and the Dominion as compensation for lands should stand as compensation for lands already alienated for the general benefit of Canada, and, that all the lands remaining within the boundaries of the respective provinces with all natural resources included, be transferred to the said provinces, the provinces accepting responsibility of administering the same.

Yours very truly,

R. P. Roblin,
Walter Scott,
Arthur L. Sifton.

This request by the Western Premiers was characterized by Mr. Borden on Feb. 24, 1914, in the House of Commons as not reasonable, and he declared that there were "some considerations to which regard must be given before these lands could be handed over to the ownership and control of the three Western provinces." Hon. W. J. Roche in the same debate also denounced the proposal as unreasonable, and said that Sir Rodmond Roblin had been constrained to sign it by pressure from Premier Scott and Premier Sifton.

THE LIBERAL POSITION

On Jan. 14, 1914, T. C. Norris moved in the Manitoba legislature a resolution calling upon the House to affirm its opinion that the natural resources of every kind and description within the province should without delay be transferred to the province by the federal government. This was adopted unanimously by the legislature. At the Liberal convention, March, 1914, the following resolution was passed:

"The Liberal party in convention assembled pledges itself to take all possible steps to secure the immediate transfer of Manitoba's lands and natural resources from the Dominion of Canada to this province."

The Record of Dr. Montague

Hon. Dr. W. H. Montague, member for Kildonan and St. Andrews, and Minister of Public Works in the Roblin government is a veteran of the Dominion political arena, whose record is of interest to the electors of Manitoba, now that he has entered provincial politics.

"The Nest of Traitors"

Dr. Montague is one of the seven Conservative ministers who, in 1896 "bolted" from the cabinet of Sir Mackenzie Bowell as the result of a plot to oust Sir Mackenzie from the leadership, an action which earned for each of the seven the opprobrium of right thinking men of all shades of polities and goaded Sir Mackenzie to the bitter public comment that "for months I have lived in a nest of traitors." One prominent Conservative paper of the day called the seven "A coterie of cut-throats and traitors who have in their actions emulated the greatest traitor of history, Judas Iscariot," while another referred to the incident as "The most abominable piece of treachery ever perpetrated upon a public man by his political friends."

The School Question in 1896

Dr. Montague in 1896 was Minister of Agriculture in the Conservative government, which was turned out of power, and in the election campaign of that year he repeatedly on the platform defended the policy of the Conservative government in its avowed intention to force separate schools on Manitoba. He defended the Remedial Bill, and declared it to be "the only proper and constitutional way" of dealing with the Manitoba school question.

Bribery in Australia

Dr. Montague's record in Australia where he went in 1901 as representative of the Independent Order of Foresters, is also of interest. It is epitomized in the finding of the Dominion Royal Commission on Life Insurance in 1907, which records the finding of a Royal Commission in Australia "that Dr. Montague, the accredited agent of the order, had been guilty of a corrupt offer of money to a member of the legislature, and of a corrupt payment of money to the Prime Minister in the interests of and for the benefit of the order." The evidence given before the Royal Commission in Australia showed that Dr. Montague had offered 50 pounds to a member named Mitchell if he would befriend the order in parliament, and Dr. Montague's own version of part of the affair was revealed in a report made by him to the head of the order, which was an exhibit at the Canadian enquiry. According to this report the Prime Minister was "to vindicate us (the I.O.F.) by personally answering in parliament questions which I would prepare, and have asked in the House, and the answers to which I would prepare for him."

The Roblin-Rogers Land Deal

Coming nearer home, there is Dr. Montague's record in connection with the Foresters, and a big land deal in which the Manitoba government figured. This was in 1903, and the facts came to light in the course of the famous libel suit by Hon. G. E. Foster against the editor of the Toronto "Globe." A document produced in this case showed

that Dr. Montague had bought from the Manitoba government for himself, Dr. Oronohyatekha, Lieut.-Col. McGillivray and George E. Foster, 5,000 acres of lands secured by the Greenway government from the Manitoba and Northwestern railway. These lands were held in trust, with others, by the Union Trust company, and in this remarkable document Dr. Montague directed the Union Trust company to convey the lands, one-fifth each to the four mentioned and one-fifth to be divided equally between Premier Roblin and Mr. Robert Rogers, then minister of public works in the Roblin government. This deal fell through, however. The evidence of Lieut.-Col. E. G. Stevenson, supreme chief ranger of the I.O.F., showed that he had intervened in the interests of the order, and insisted that as the speculation was being financed with money belonging to the I.O.F., the order should own every acre of the 40,000 acres included in the whole deal. He carried his point, and Dr. Montague gave a quit claim deed for all the lands. Thus he failed to deliver the goods, but it was not his fault.

The Queen Victoria Placard

More amusing, but of interest as showing the type of the man and his methods is the historic affair of the cards used by Dr. Montague in one of his early elections in Haldimand, when he tried to make the Indians believe that he brought them a proclamation from Queen Victoria, calling upon them to vote for the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. The card, got up in the style of a proclamation, read thus:

"FOR INDIANS ONLY."

"To the Indians:—The Queen has always loved her dear loyal subjects, the Indians. She wants them to be good men and women, and she wants them to live on the land that they have, and she expects in a little while, if her great chief, John A., gets into government again, to be very kind to the Indians, and to make them very happy. She wants them to go and vote, and to all vote for Dr. Montague, who is the Queen's agent. He is their friend, and by voting for him every one of the Canadians will please

"Queen Victoria."

The Movable University

A history of the university question in Manitoba during the past four years would consist largely of a record of a series of manoeuvres by which the Roblin government forced the university council to abandon a suitable site worth not less than \$800,000.

At the time (October, 1910) that the government bought the new agricultural site at St. Vital the university council had before it the offer of two free sites for the university buildings, one in Kildonan, the other, made by F. W. Heubach and Co., in Tuxedo Park, immediately adjoining Assiniboine Park, the property of the city of Winnipeg.

Immediately upon the announcement being made of the new location of the agricultural college, it was reported in interested real estate circles that the government would force the university to go to St. Vital also, and, as the sequel showed, it accomplished its purpose, though not without resistance from the university council.

At a meeting of the university council, held October 8, 1910, Dr. J. K. Barret and E. L. Taylor intimated that the council could get a free site for the university at St. Vital if it made a request to this effect to the government. This did not accord with the judgment of the council, which at this meeting accepted a resolution looking towards the acceptance of the offer of a site at Tuxedo. Six months later, March, 1911, Mr. Heubach's offer was formally accepted, the necessary documents signed, and authority given to the council to expend \$20,000 in improving the property.

The government which was determined that the university should not be placed upon the Tuxedo site, insisted, as a condition to giving the necessary grants to the university, that it should remain on the 6½ acres of the original site on Broadway, Winnipeg. In March, 1912, the government proposed to the university to enlarge this site to 9 acres, but a conditional acceptance of this offer by the university council, on the understanding that it did not preclude it from going to Tuxedo at a later period, was rejected by Sir Rodmond Roblin.

The university council, finding it impossible to overcome the government's hostility to the Tuxedo site, and knowing that it was impossible to establish a university on the site on Broadway, proffered by the government, finally took the course which the government intended from the outset to drive it to, and in January, 1913, applied for a site at St. Vital. The government graciously acceded to this request, giving the university a site of 137 acres between the agricultural college buildings and the river, thereby reducing the college farm from 572 acres to 435.

The outcome of this series of manoeuvres by the government was that the university, that is to say, the province, lost 160 acres of ground worth \$800,000, while the agricultural college farm, none too large for its purposes in its original form, was greatly restricted in area in order to find a place for the university. The explanation of the government's insistence upon the St. Vital site, is believed to be its de-

sire to help out the extensive real estate speculations entered into by its friends at St. Vital; coincident with the establishment there of the agricultural college. Strong objection to the location of the university at St. Vital was voiced at the time by the farm papers of Manitoba.

Thus the Nor'-West Farmer in Jan. 1913, said: "From the standpoint of the agricultural college there is only one thing to say, and that is that the proposed division of the farm is simply ruinous. We have no hesitancy in saying that if the Manitoba university is located on the east end of the Manitoba Agricultural College grounds, the latter institution is very largely spoiled. Not only will the remaining farm be cramped, but by all means the choicest portion of the property will have been given up. In addition, the buildings, which have been located so as to be in best relationship to the entire piece of land, will be thrown against the extreme end of the land remaining, and some of the most valuable lines of college work which were planned to be carried on on the east side of the farm must be altogether abandoned. This is all to occur without any reason at all being given out as to why the proposed change should be made."

This was the comment of the Grain Growers' Guide: "The farmers of Manitoba have a vital interest in the work of the agricultural college in Winnipeg, and will therefore not view with favor the attempt being made to curtail the agricultural college grounds for the location of the university. The 572 acres devoted to the agricultural college is not by any means too large an area of land for this purpose. The agricultural college board has entered a protest against the location of the university on the college grounds. They do not believe that such close relations with the university authorities will be to the ultimate benefit of the agricultural college. The atmosphere surrounding the agricultural college should be distinctly sympathetic to rural life and conditions, and its aim should be to educate its students back to the land where they may use their training to raise the general standard of rural life: . . . From the university standpoint, also, the proposal to place it on the agricultural college grounds is a mistake. The university was already in possession of 160 acres of land worth \$800,000, donated as a free site in the middle of Tuxedo Park, only four and one-half miles from the centre of the city. The new scheme compels the university to give up this valuable property, and allow it to go back to its original owners. By locating on the agricultural college grounds the university will have in reality only about 90 acres of land, part of which is very low and which is located seven and one-half miles from the city. Of course, the location of the university near the agricultural college will be a good thing for the land speculators, but it is about time that more attention was paid to public interest. The university and the agricultural college have been trotted around and located in various places for the benefit of land speculators."

Hydro-Electric Development

The Liberal party, at the Provincial Convention in Winnipeg, March, 1914, committed itself to the encouragement of hydro-electric development so far as feasible throughout the province, in the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

That the Liberal party favors the extension of hydro-electric power throughout the province, so as to enable the benefits of light and power at reasonable rates to be enjoyed by as large a portion of the province as is economically feasible.

First Advocated by Norris

The advisability of enquiring into the possibilities of hydro-electric development for the province at large was first advocated by T. C. Norris, leader of the Liberal party, who introduced a resolution in the legislature, January 16, 1913, asking that the Public Utilities Commissioner be instructed to report on the water powers of the province and the feasibility of distribution of power. In spite of the fact that the resolution came from the opposition, it was unanimously adopted by the house, and since that time an exhaustive investigation has been undertaken by engineers working under the Public Utilities Commission. In the course of a speech during which he cited the success of the hydro-electric commission of Ontario, Mr. Norris urged that the province should secure control of all the available water powers, and predicted that the time when they would be used, and their benefits transmitted to the towns and farms was not very far distant.

The report made by Judge Robson, based on the observations and reports of the engineers of the water power branch of the Department of the Interior of the Dominion, and on the reports of W. E. Skinner on distribution, probable cost and probable users, discouraged the project at the present time on the ground that it would hardly be commercially feasible. It must be remembered, however, that Judge Robson's report was on a system to cover practically the whole province, this being his instruction, and it was not at all unexpected that such a report would be unfavorable.

W. E. Skinner, the engineering expert, who reported for Judge Robson, addressing the Jovians of Winnipeg, a society of men in the electrical trade a short time ago, stated "Certain portions of this transmission line it might be possible to build and operate at a profit," and, in closing, said "I wish to predict that within the lifetime of many of the Jovians before me we will see the best part of the "white coal" of this province utilized, and what the future of Winnipeg and Manitoba will be if this is accomplished I leave to your imagination.

Unlimited Power Available

The reports referred to show that Manitoba is particularly well favored in the matter of water powers, due to the geological and topographical features of the province. The water powers that have been surveyed are shown to have the enormous possible total of 3,037,365 horse-power on a 24-hour basis the year round, while there are other summer flows that show a horse-power of 218,000 between May and October. In

addition there is the White Dog concentration, just across the boundary line in Ontario, within 100 miles of Winnipeg, which shows 55,000 horse-power additional, and which would be easily available. The main power is on the Winnipeg River, and the greater part of it is easily accessible from Winnipeg.

Success in Winnipeg

The City of Winnipeg has given a wonderful illustration of the possibilities of public ownership and administration of hydro-electrical energy in its system which develops power at Point du Bois, on the Winnipeg River, 77 miles from Winnipeg. The light and power department of the city is probably the finest example of public ownership in America. In spite of having cut prices to one-third of those formerly charged by the Winnipeg Electric, giving citizens the cheapest light and power on the continent, the business is not only paying its way but is now showing a handsome profit on the outlay, which now amounts to something over \$3,500,000.

In Ontario

The Province of Ontario, through the hydro-electric commission, has successfully supplied electric energy from Niagara Falls throughout a very large part of that province, to the great benefit of the farming communities as well as the residents of the cities and towns.

High tension wires carry 110,000 voltage from Niagara to Toronto, and there are similar lines to London, Windsor and other centres, with radiating lines of 13,200 voltage to the smaller circuits. Thus Dundas; Guelph, Preston, Berlin, Stratford, and St. Mary's are each a centre for radiating 13,200 volt lines from the main 110,000 volt line that runs to London, and the Windsor 110,000 volt mine supplies Brant, Woodstock, St. Thomas, Kent, Essex and several other districts. From each of these the energy is transmitted to the farms and villages, and there are now all over Ontario farms in which the houses and stables, etc., are all lighted by electricity at low cost, while power is used for all purposes, including electric stoves, vacuum cleaners, milking machines, cream separator, churns, threshing machines, root cutters, grain grinders, straw cutters, ensilage cutters, etc.

The hydro-electric commission has been able to sell energy at prices which have made it possible for a large proportion of the farmers to take advantage of the unique opportunity, and the result has been a great advance in farming methods.

INDEX

Agricultural Policy	99
Farm Credits	101
Agricultural College	112
Beautiful Plains Election Outrage	110
Boundary Settlement	126
Direct Legislation	56
Roblin's Condemnation	56
Roblin's Change of Front	59
The Liberal Policy	60
Education	5
The Liberal Policy	5
Government Resistance to Compulsory Education	5
Bernier's Declaration Against Compulsory Education	6
Ontario Compulsory Law	7
Declarations in favor of Compulsory Education	8
School Inspector's Reports	11
Children's Protection Act	13
Truancy Act, 1914	13
Compulsory Laws in Other Provinces	15
Bilingual Schools	15
Neglect of Education of Foreign Children	17
Government Grants to Schools	18
Illiteracy in Manitoba	19
Coldwell Amendments	19
Winnipeg School Board and Coldwell Amendments	21
Bernier on Coldwell Amendments	22
Larger Grants for Schools	24
Karmansky	24
Election Outrages. (Macdonald)	78
Eli Sand	83
Elevators	95
Irregularities in Purchase	96
Griswold Fiasco	97
Partisan Management	97
Elevators—Roblin the Friend of—	113
Farm Credits	101

Finances of Province	02
Public Utilities	02
Growth of Public Debt	04
Cost of Running the Machine	05
Public Lands	06
Municipal Revenues Suffer	07
General Notes on Finances	08
Telegram—Payments to—	09
Good Roads	116
Gimli—By-election Corruption	118
By-election Trial	124
Hydro-Electric Development	135
"Jelly-Bag Englishman"	75
Lands and Natural Resources	120
Macdonald Election Outrages	78
Walkinshaw Case	78
Sullivan Case	79
Sifton Case	80
Prince Case	81
Personators Freed	81
Montague, Hon. Dr., Record	131
Municipal Control of Taxation	117
Natural Resources	126
Platform of Manitoba Liberals	1
Railways	70
The J. P. McDonald Deal	70
Purchase of Northern Pacific	70
Reduction of Wheat Rates	72
Bond Guarantees	73
Resolutions, Convention, 1914	2
Roblin—The Samuel Incident	75
Eli Sand	83
Some Sayings	105
Friend of the Elevators	113
Russell, Theft of Seat, 1910	111
Samuel, Rt. Hon. Herbert. ("Jelly Bag")	75
Taxation, Municipal Control	117

Temperance	27
The Liberal Policy	27
Government's Record	27
Carman Breach of Faith	32
Clubs Investigation Refused	35-42
Clubs Protected	42
The Liberal Record	36
Treating Habit Applauded by Roblin and Coldwell	38
The Difference Between the Parties	40
Licenses, Growth of	41
Condemnation of Government Record	41
Dr. G. B. Wilson's Impeachment of Roblin	45
Norris on Temperance Issue	47
Stanley Brewing Co.	48
Telephones	85
Promises of Lower Rates	85
Purchase of Bell System	87
Exorbitant Price Paid	88
Fictitious Surpluses	88
Increased Long Distance Charges	89
Attempt to Raise Rates	90
Investigation Commission	91
The New Rates	92
University	132
Woman Suffrage	50
The Liberal Policy	50
The "Mess of Politics"	51
Roblin's Rejection of Principle	51
In Europe	52
In the United States	53
In the Antipodes	54

Notes